

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

House of Assembly

For the period:

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

March 1, 1977

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the Leader of the Opposition is here today or not. I am sorry he is not in his seat at this time. After the announcement of the private placement bond issue with Alberta yesterday, which could only be made in the House at six o'clock to coincide with the statement being made by the Premier of Alberta in Edmonton at two-thirty when their House opened, there was very little time, I suppose, for people to analyze what was said and so on. But I find it most unfortunate that there should be a negative reaction to this particular announcement. I would ask all hon. members to take it in the spirit in which it was meant.

The fact is that the ten per cent which the Leader of the Opposition said was too high is in fact an exceptionally good rate for the credit rating of this Province. A private placement is usually considerably higher than a market placement where in this case - and the reason for that of course is because of the exposure on the market and because of commission that is paid to the consortium and so on, - in this case the private placement was at the same rate or even a bit better than we could get on the public market. It also happens to be a twenty-one year paper.

Mr. Speaker, the European issue that was done some ten days ago, there was no mention of it as far as debate in the House itself was concerned. I do not know if it was because it was Alberta or because it was the form of government in this Province or what that prompted the reaction from the Leader of the Opposition when, in fact, we announced just ten days ago the money we raised in Europe. He thought that was fine. I find it almost incredible. I do not know if the members of the Opposition can tell me or not, but when he gets up in the morning, does he hope it rains or what? I mean I just do not

PREMIER MOORES: ..

know. But the fact is, Sir, that the European issue, there was no mention of it. The Quebec scene in Canada has, in fact, made it difficult because of the uncertainty it has created about Canada, not just about Newfoundland, it has made it difficult for borrowing in the international markets.

I think this loan yesterday was - Alberta has the money which they want to loan. We have a borrowing programme, Europe, Canada and the U.S. which we have to have to provide even the minimum of services we have in this Province. We are at a difficult time in borrowing circumstances in Canada. For two sister provinces to be able to get together, for one province to

PREMIER MOORES: show a reaffirmation in the confidence they have in Canada, I think, Sir, that is nothing but good for this country. I am very sorry the Leader of the Opposition is not here as I say, because I am sure in his own heart he must feel the same way although I am very sorry about his reaction yesterday. But, Sir, the fact is this is a step in the right direction for Canada and we are fortunate to be part of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I assume that the amount in question is in connection with next year's needs or next year's borrowing programme. If it is may I ask the Premier if this was borrowed under authority of the Loan and Guarantee Act that passed in the current financial year and under authority of this year's act but, in actual fact, for use in the coming financial year, is that the situation?

PREMIER MOORES: The situation is that there is authority granted by this House for \$197 million last year. That goes on until the new loan bill is debated in this House. That \$50 million fits within that \$197 million but, in fact, the money will be used for next year but under the authority of the House we have every right to borrow it this year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I thank the Premier for this information, it is exactly what I assumed. But I thought I understood from the Minister of Finance that the full total had been reached in the amount that was borrowed in Europe two or three weeks ago, that that exhausted the authority granted by the House to the government to borrow in the current financial year and what I was wondering was whether in fact this \$50 million from Alberta is to come - is it a loan or is a prospective loan, which will be authorized by

MR. SMALLWOOD: a loan bill to be brought in in the current session, affecting next year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, and the Minister of Finance can correct me on this, that the amount borrowed in Europe looks after our budgeted amount for this year but in effect the borrowing authority by the House was in excess of that, and whilst legally we can borrow the fact is we are borrowing towards next year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I gather from what the hon. gentleman has said that the authority given by the House in the Loan and Guarantee Bill which became an act, is authority to borrow more than the government programmed.

PREMIER MOORES: That is right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They programmed \$197 million, or \$196 million point something, that they had in borrowing \$20 million in Europe the other day that exhausted the programme of actual borrowing though they have authority in the act to borrow more and it is under that authority that they are borrowing this \$50 million. Is that the case?

MR. DOODY: I do not know if this is in order but I will try to clarify the situation for hon. members.

MR. NEARY: Just on a point of information Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order I presume.

MR. NEARY: A point of order, Sir. Several times during last session I rose to say a few words on various ministerial statements and I was shot down by Your Honour. But this session, Sir, we have precedent. The member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) the other day commented on a ministerial statement. The member for Twillingate, I think, commented on a ministerial statement. Now we have the Premier making a ministerial statement and we have the Minister of Finance commenting on it. Now does that open it up, Sir? Does that leave it wide open so that poor old members like myself can have a few words too?

MR. DOODY: On that point of order, if I may.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. gentleman speaking to the point of order.

MR. DOODY: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: I will hear the Minister of Finance, then the hon. member.

MR. DOODY: It is not necessary for me to elaborate at this time.

I can wait for the Question period and go into it if the question is raised at that time. I would be only too happy to answer it.

And I think that may be the proper procedure to follow.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, it has been the accepted practice

that the Opposition reacts to a ministerial statement and in this particular case the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) is reacting on behalf of this side of the House and, you know,

MR. WHITE: _____ we understand that he is allowed to make a few comments and ask some questions, so that is what he is doing.

MR. SPEAKER: On the point of order brought up, first I must clarify a factual or an allegation as to a fact, and that was the hon. member for LaPoile stated that previously in this session other hon. members had commented on a Ministerial Statement. The statement that they are referring to and this is from memory was one by the hon. Minister of Justice, as I recall, of condolence and sympathy on behalf of the Newfoundland people - an accident that had occurred in Central Newfoundland, an helicopter accident - and although the hon. minister got up after I had said statements by ministers, that technically was not a Ministerial Statement, it was the hon. gentleman did not catch my eye before I, in fact, read out statements by ministers. It was an expression of condolence. The hon. member for Exploits had a few words, as it happened in his area, and I believe at least one hon. gentleman to my right, the hon. member for Conception Bay South did.

But that was not in a technical sense a Ministerial Statement and what happened there does not alter the rules with respect to ministerial statements which are that the leader of a recognized group, or a spokesman on his behalf, may make brief comments and ask for explanations, and that is what I consider the hon. member for Twillingate is doing. He is asking for information, and at the Premier's acquiescence the Minister of Finance is answering on his behalf. I do not see that it would be an unusual occurrence. If it were to be a long series of questions, it would be better left for the Question Period. But as I understand it, the hon. member for Twillingate is making brief comments, and asking for explanations and instead of getting the explanations at the end of his comments, the ministry are providing them to him during his comments. Presumably this will assist the hon. member in his comments, and I do not see that there is anything wrong with it. But obviously if there were a long series

MR. SPEAKER: of questions and answers, it would be better for the Question Period, but at this particular time I do not see that the procedure is out of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, on a further of order, Sir, I am not splitting hairs, I am not arguing about the hon. member for Twillingate asking questions of the minister that made the Ministerial Statement, but, Sir, in my opinion, the Premier who made the Ministerial Statement has the right to consult with the Minister of Finance, and the Minister of Finance can give the Hon. the Premier the information and the Hon. Premier will relay it to the House.

But, Sir, to have two ministers answering questions, I mean, this is not the Oral Question Period, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that the answers to the questions put by my hon. friend should be answered by the Premier. Now the Minister of Finance is sitting next to him, the hon. Minister of Finance can give the Premier whatever information he thinks he should have to answer the questions.

But in my opinion, Sir, and I am not questioning Your Honour's ruling, this is another point of order, it is the Premier, the gentleman who made the Ministerial Statement, who is the one who should answer the questions, or clarify any situations that may be put to him.

MR. SPEAKER: On that second point of order, I would have to have the Hansards checked on this. I do not think it is the wish of the hon. members that I adjourn now to do so, but I do believe that within our precedents there will be instances whereby a question of explanation, asked of the Premier or a minister, that information had then been supplied on his behalf by another minister, I would have to have the Hansards checked on that but to the best of my knowledge, there would be former practice for that. And I think it is a question of degree. If several ministers were to get in or more than one, this is on a financial matter, the Minister of

MR. SPEAKER:

Finance, is giving information on behalf of the Premier, and to the best of my knowledge, there would be precedent for that. As I say it is a question of degree, if numerous people were to get involved then obviously it would not be proper.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Finance.

Mr. Doody:

As I said there is no need really for the hassle at all, the question can be asked in the Oral Question period, and I would be only too happy to supply the information or I can provide it now whichever the House prefers.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oral Question period.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. the Premier and the hon. Minister of Finance for their response to my questions which I asked by way of getting some information, to enable me to make a very, very brief comment on the raising of the loan. What I gather is, well first I ought to say, Mr. Speaker, that Newfoundland about ten or fifteen years ago brought itself into conformity with all the other provinces of Canada by introducing and passing legislation giving the government authority to go in on the market at any moment, a favourable market, when the favourable opportunity arose to seize that opportunity and float a bond issue. But the present administration changed that, they brought legislation in here changing it, so that every time they borrow they must do it on authority of a specific bill that has been brought in and been debated and adopted and become an Act.

So what I was trying to find out, was whether this \$20 million was in fact borrowed under a statute that was passed authorizing the government to raise money? And the answer I get is that it was. Which makes me draw the conclusion in view of the Minister of Finance's statement a couple of weeks or so ago that the loan raised in Euro-dollars completed the borrowing programme for the current year, for the current year, bringing it to the projected amount that they were going to spend which is \$196.5 millions. In the light of that I assumed that the \$50 million must be for the coming year, starting April 1st. and that it was borrowed on authority of an Act of the House that was passed. And that being so it only means that the first \$50 million of what is to be borrowed next year has been raised and raised within Canada from a sister

Mr. Smallwood:

province. And that seems to be clear enough, and there does not seem to be much room for doubt, except the one, of course, which will be better expressed when the budget debate comes, and that is the wisdom of all this borrowing.

PRESENTING REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. T. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Tourist Establishment Regulations for 1976.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the answer to Question No. 13 on the Order Paper of February 8, as requested by the hon. member from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), and that has to do with the school tax authorities. Also the answer to Question No. 81 on the Order Paper of February 9, and Question No. 95, February 10, asked by the hon. member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary). These two have to do with the Educational Research Institute and the Student Appeals Board.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and the Environment.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply briefly to the hon. member from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) with reference to his fears, with reference to the Dam at Red Indian Lake. And I thank him for his letter to me just explaining. And I might say that I did consult this morning with our hydrologist, we have one qualified hydrologist in the department, Dr. W. Ullah, and he assured that as far as he was concerned the Dam there was potentially in shape enough to handle any flood waters that might occur in the area. And if there are any further fears then again he expressed the wish that he would like the hon. member to go over again, and perhaps go into the whole thing in detail so he could give the hon. member some background on the thing. And while I am on that, Sir,

Mr. Murphy.

I would just like to say this - I do not know if I tried to make myself clear yesterday - that during the flood waters there I had a gentleman from my department fly over the area just to get some idea of what was happening. And in this morning's news, I have a quote here, "If that dam were to go, Badger would be under water," Mr. Flight observed. 'I do not think there is any fear of the dam breaking,' the minister said. 'We had a man fly over it in a helicopter.'" So if there is any fear of flood just let me know, and I will get someone to fly over it in a helicopter, and that will do away with all the fear of the dam breaking.

And with reference to another question, I believe the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) with reference to a question of the Minister of Transportation re car wrecks - was that the question?

MR. HODDER: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: I did get a statement here from my department with reference to this. This was, as the minister explained, the Minister of Transportation - the funding department was in Highways at that time of transportation and the balance of checking and whatnot was in the Department of the Environment. And the statement just says this: "The agreement between government and affiliated Marine, Metal and Salvage Limited with respect to the abandoned vehicle programme provides that a sum of \$27.50 be paid to the company for the collection, processing and disposal of each abandoned vehicle. This amount is payable as follows; seventy-five per cent upon collection and processing - that is flattening - and twenty-five per cent upon disposal. During the initial stages of the abandoned vehicle programme some 1,611 vehicles were inadvertently one hundred per cent paid for upon collection, and not disposed of until a later date. This matter has since been corrected as follows; 879 vehicles were subsequently

Mr. Murphy.

disposed of at no further cost to government. In other words they shipped out 879 for which they did not get the twenty-five per cent, which under the agreement they would be entitled to had they not received it at the collection period. The balance of the twenty-five per cent overpayment in respect to the remaining 732 vehicles was subsequently recovered from future payments to the company during 1976-1977. In other words where they were entitled to seventy-five per cent, they only got fifty per cent, because of the fact that they had been overpaid due to some processing of their invoice in the department between Transportation and the Department of the Environment. So as we stand now, we have notified the Auditor General of this fact, and he is aware of it. The account is square now as far as collection and payments are concerned." Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in reply to an oral question placed yesterday by the hon. gentleman from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) with regards to the licencing of snowmobiles and all-terrain vehicles. The decision of the department is to the effect that there will be no extension to the deadline, which was yesterday's date, for licening of these vehicles. However, in cases where applications have been made to the department up until and prior to yesterday, and where the applicant can show proof that the application has been filed by means, for example, of a receipt or money order, that these proofs will be used as an authority to operate these vehicles. So I have asked my colleague, the Minister of Justice to inform the law enforcement agencies accordingly.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: A question for the Minister of Finance regarding the announced loan yesterday from the Province of Alberta, and it is in two parts. One, is there a brokerage firm involved in the loan or will the money come direct from government to government? If there is a brokerage firm who is it and what is the cost involved? And if there are legal services involved is that done by the Department of Justice or another legal firm? And again who is it?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DOODY: The first part of the question, I think, was, is this a direct borrowing from government to government or is there a brokerage house involved? It is a direct borrowing from the officials of the Department of Finance on behalf of government with their counterparts in the Province of Alberta. There is no fee involved. That in itself, of course, is a substantial saving, and that is one of the reasons I am wearing my Alberta necktie today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DOODY: The second half of the question if gentlemen will please control themselves. Was there a legal service provided? The Department of Justice

MR. DOODY:

as always advises the department on all borrowing programmes and all borrowing processes. Obviously this one could not have taken place unless the government of Alberta and ourselves had gotten the legal opinion from the Department of Justice that the borrowing was indeed within the limits of the Loan Act that is presently operative in the House and the opinion of the Department of Justice acquiesced and agreed to by their legal counterparts in Alberta, that this borrowing was indeed within the context of the present Loan Bill. I can elaborate on that Loan Bill thing if you want me to.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier in connection with this particular loan. In Alberta the Premier, Premier Lougheed, announced this on live television yesterday because they have been smart enough to get television into their House. But you know the impression seemed to be left on the National News which I saw last night - and I saw both National Newscasts - in one it said that Alberta was coming to the aid of financially stricken Newfoundland. I was wondering if the Premier, number one, has a copy of Mr. Lougheed's statement and number two, if the Province was having difficulty borrowing elsewhere.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: First of all I have got a copy of Premier Lougheed's statement. I have not got it with me, Mr. Speaker. That was not the intent. I think it is very fair to say that here was an agency with money to lend and a borrower who needed to borrow money. The fact is that the lender in this case happened to have the confidence in both the future of this Province, the lender, they happened to have the confidence in the administration and they also thought they were loaning on a good bet. Now they may not like that on the other side, Mr. Speaker, but after the comments from the Leader of the Opposition last night one would suggest he knows more about -

MR. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member interjected on a point of order. I have to draw to the hon. Premier's attention that his latter remarks were of the nature of debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if he or any of his colleagues are aware that the financing of the regional college at Corner Brook appears to be in some difficulty because of mechanics liens that have been issued against the property as a result of Group Systems Limited not paying their bills.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: No, Sir, I do not know anything about Group Systems Limited. I have been told that the people who originally built the regional college have been trying to refinance the cost of building it and have been experiencing some difficulty with the refinancing.

MR. NEARY: Western Realities?

MR. DOODY: Yes, whatever their name is. But over and above that I have had no indication about mechanics liens or nonpayments of debts. Of course I guess in my old honesty I am prepared to say that really is not our concern. It is the builders concern. We have an obligation to pay them an agreed amount of money per year under the lease and this will do. There are no mechanics liens on the Province that is for sure.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware that Western Realities, the company that the government entered into an agreement with to build the regional college passed the agreement on to an investment company in Ontario? Is the minister aware of that? If so, would the minister indicate to the House if, as a result of these mechanics liens - and there is a whole raft of them down in the registry office - is the government withholding any amounts that are owing to Western Realities as a result of Group Systems Limited not paying their bills to the various subcontractors and people who supplied material for the regional college at Corner Brook?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge there are no mechanics liens or no other actions against government. Our obligation and our commitment has been to the company who put the building up, and you know we are honouring our obligations. Any difficulties or legal obligations that people have taken or feel that they have a right to take against the company is between the company and these people. It is not an obligation of government and I have not been made aware of it. But I guess for that reason, because it is not our direct concern at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question. Would the minister try to straighten me out on mechanics liens that have been issued against the property, the regional college in Corner Brook? If the court awards say the amounts that are owing to these creditors who have taken out mechanics liens would not then they be able to make a claim against the regional college?

MR. NEARY: and where would the government fit then? What is the legal position of the government then? Would they come and take the furniture out of the college for instance to satisfy the mechanics lien.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I have to enunciate the rule that one may not ask a minister for a legal opinion.

The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: All I can say, Sir, is the government will honour all its obligations that it has under any existing agreement and if there are liens or mechanics liens or any other sort of obligation that government is responsible for then certainly government will honour them, but that is as far as I can go with the thing. If there is some legal opinion to be required then I suggest I refer them elsewhere.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. It is with respect to the ferry services in the Province, those that may be particularly identified as an extension of our own road services and I suppose what I am saying is, excluding the Argenta and the Port aux Basques ferry and possibly the Bell Island.

The question is, Sir, I wonder if the minister is in a position to inform the House as to whether there is any regulatory body to whom operators have to report to in the event of increasing the fares and whether there is some regulatory body or agency to whom the residents served by these ferries may approach in the event that they are not satisfied with the quality of the service by the ferries.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in our Province, as was debated last week on the Late Show, last Thursday, the same question was debated and it was explained then that we have seven ferry services in the Province, one of them being the service to St. Brendan's, which

MR. MORGAN: I am sure the hon. gentleman from Terra Nova is concerned about, in his own district.

The regulatory body which is responsible for the adequacy or the satisfaction of the service is the federal regulatory body of the CTC, the Canadian Transportation Commission. So any complaints with regards to the level of service or the adequacy of the service, or the facilities used in that service, these complaints would have to be presently taken to the CTC.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary?

MR. LUSH: I want to say I would like to debate the answer or debate the thing in the Late Show on Thursday, but the thing is I am not familiar with what transpired on -

MR. WHITE: It is in the Hansard.

MR. MORGAN: It is in the Hansard, a full debate on it.

MR. LUSH: Okay, well I want to debate the thing on -

MR. MORGAN: Yes.

MR. LUSH: - that is on Thursday.

MR. SPEAKER: The procedure is outlined in the Standing Orders, the hon. member will have comply with it.

The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications, and I must say I am very pleased with his answer to my question of yesterday.

I wonder if the minister could elaborate a little bit and tell me whether or not the policy as he just announced applies just to isolated communities in the Province, or is it policy to cover the whole Province relative to snowmobile licencing.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, it is a blanket policy covering all the Province. In other words any person who is caught operating an all-terrain vehicle or a snowmobile vehicle as of today and if he cannot show proof that application has been made for a licence, if his machine is not licenced then he is operating that machine illegally. So it is a blanket policy all over the Province.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transportation and Communications. When Dart Construction went into receivership some small sub-contractors were left not paid for work done. Now it would seem that a lot of this work was done under government sponsored projects. Would the minister advise the House if the government is presently withholding funds, originally due to Dart Construction, for disbursement to these small sub-contractors and others who found themselves left holding the bag, so to speak, when Dart went into receivership.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, to answer the hon. gentleman's question, first of all may I clarify part of his question and that is that the company concerned has not declared bankruptcy, has not gone into receivership. However, with regard to funds owed to that company concerning a project that was in connection with the Department of Transportation, a road project in the Bonavista Peninsula area, taking in two districts, Trinity North and Bonavista South, so far the employees connected with that project have been paid. There are a

Mr. Morgan.

number of outstanding bills in particular the trucking people involved. They have not been paid to date. A number of bills like, for example, grocery store supplies, service station bills, these kind of items. The present situation is that consultation is taking place between the Department of Transportation and Communications, the Department of Finance, and the Department of Justice, mainly based on the fact that the company concerned has not declared bankruptcy. So it is sort of a quasi bankruptcy or receivership situation.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that whatever happened to Dart, whether it was bankruptcy or receivership or whatever, happened over two months ago. Would the minister indicate to the House when the disbursement of those funds will be made?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, as soon as the consultations and discussions are concluded between the three departments concerned, and hopefully it will be as soon as possible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Rural Development, I would like to direct a question to the Premier. Is the Premier aware of the fact that the Minister of Rural Development has been approached by the upper Trinity South Development Association or the Society for the Retention of the Sealing Industry for financial assistance to counteract the vicious smear campaign being carried out by those who would destroy the sealing hunt? And if or if not, is the Premier aware of the fact that has an Order-in-Council been passed for assistance in the amount of \$5,000 toward that particular society?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: The answer is, yes, to the question, Mr. Speaker.

I think it was done as recently as this morning. The situation is that whilst we cannot do anything as far as the international publicity of people like Greenpeace and Davies and Weber and whoever they may be is concerned because of the massive amount of money that would be created, seeing as they have brought so much brass with them to this Province, we figured that those who are concerned should be given the opportunity to go to St. Anthony where the action is going to be. And certainly anything that we can do in a minor way, and it has to be a minor way, unfortunately, to counteract these other people who are coming in here, we are trying to do.

MR. ROWE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Premier and the government for that small amount of assistance. But in view of the fact that there are a tremendous number of these bleeding hearts coming into this Province and smearing the Newfoundland name, the people of Newfoundland, is the government prepared to undertake some sort of a larger long-range programme to counteract these bleeding hearts?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, that has been answered, I think, many times in this House before, and as I said, it would cost millions of dollars to do what, in effect, is almost an impossible task. Because to go out on the defensive for an industry even though we in this Province realize the traditional value of that industry and the culture that the industry even evolved from or culture even from the industry - the fact is that to go to Western Europe, to go to Trafalgar Square with billboards, to go to New York, to go to Los Angeles is just a physical impossibility and far too much money, and certainly for the amount of money you would have you could never give it the priority in our spending in the Province. So as much as we understand the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) in

Premier Moores.

his remarks, the fact is, I think, to be realistic, that cannot be done. What we can do is to try to protect ourselves in the Province and if anyone asks a question stand up and say, why it is important to us. Because I think that we can do, but to sell to little old ladies in white running shoes in Soho may be more difficult.

MR. ROWE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROWE: I appreciate what the Premier had to say, Mr. Speaker, but I was not thinking necessarily of advertising in Europe or in the United States or anywhere else. But these people will be coming - by way of a brief preamble - these people will be coming in helicopters and aircraft and what have you, and they will obviously be hopscotching all over the Northern Peninsula on the ice floes. Would the government, for example, give consideration to making the government aircraft or helicopters available to these people to counteract the publicity, adverse publicity, right here on our own front, on the sealing front, the ice front?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I do not know if I got the question absolutely correct or not, because there was more talking around me, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately than on the other side of the House. So having said that, I think, MOT regulations and this sort of thing would make that impossible to do anyway. And just to clarify what I said previously, I noticed the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) gave a bit of a shiver when I said, "The little old ladies and their \$2 from Soho," I am sure that there are ladies there who would give \$2 as well as receive \$2.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile followed by the hon. gentleman for Lewisporte.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like for the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Sir, to clarify a statement he made yesterday in connection with the controversy

Mr. Neary:

raging between the Mount Pearl Town Council, the minister's department and the Minor Hockey Association. Would the minister tell the House if it is proper, indeed if it is legal for the minister's department to commit financing to an organization other than the Mount Pearl Town Council, and then have the Mount Pearl Town Council pick up the tab and pay out the money without having any control over how that money is spent?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must point out again that the asking of a legal opinion is not permitted by the rules, and asking for government's policy etc. in a particular area is - but the rules are quite clear on that.

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. J. DINN: Well, Mr. Speaker, just to clarify that situation any monies given to the Town Council of Mount Pearl for the arena is done just exactly that way, is done through the Town Council. The government has guaranteed that the stadium will be given another additional, I believe, through Rehabilitation and Recreation and Municipal Affairs and Housing, \$350,000. That will be given to the Town Council, and from the Town Council through to the Recreation Committee. So there is no problem there as I see it.

The problem that they have at the Town Council is apparently they do not believe they are getting the funds. They will indeed get them, and they should not put it in their budget as a deficit, and that is what should be cleared up.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the minister, of course, is aware that the member from Mount Pearl (Mr. N. Windsor) delivered a letter last night to the Town Council signed by Mr. Harold Collins, the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation, saying that they were going to get \$150,000 from that department. But the question I want to put to the minister, Sir, is this - this was only delivered last night, this commitment was made that they now know they are going to get it -

Mr. Neary:

but the question is this, the Council had no say at all in how this money was being spent. Now is this the policy of the government to force the Town Council in one case to get a bond issue, and in another case to accept \$150,000 to pay bills when they had no say at all, no control over how these bills were incurred. Is this the policy of the minister's department?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Well as far as, Mr. Speaker, Municipal Affairs and Housing is concerned if the Town Council of Mount Pearl does not want the money because they are unhappy with the way it is being spent then obviously I would be delighted to spend it elsewhere.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Then is the minister satisfied that the financial statements that have been received from the Mount Pearl Minor Hockey Association, is the minister satisfied that they are in order, that they give the details that the minister's officials asked the Town Council of Mount Pearl to supply to the minister's department?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the financial statement has been thoroughly gone into, but with respect to the Recreation Commission or Committee whatever it is, they had a financial statement done, and the department has received that to my knowledge, there is absolutely nothing wrong with it.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The original questioner, a supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Is the minister aware, Mr. Speaker, that on January 31, Mr. G. Goodland, Director of Municipal Finance asked the Town Clerk in Mount Pearl to supply details of individual costs of the construction of an arena in that community? And if the minister is aware of that, will the minister tell the House if this information

Mr. Neary:

has indeed been supplied to Mr. Goodland, to the satisfaction of the officials of the minister's department?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the required information to my knowledge has been supplied to my Deputy Minister, and there was some confusion with Mr. Goodland, and he was sent in to check over some of the expenses etc. for the town with regard to their deficit position. So he was not aware that the information that he required had already been received in the department, and that is where the confusion was. And, yes, I am aware of a letter gone from Mr. Goodland to the Town, and it was just an unfortunate situation.

MR. F. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow one further supplementary. The hon. member from Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the supplementary is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Are we to take it from what the minister has said, yesterday he referred to the October financial statement, and then there was, you know, letters from his department exchanged and so on, are we to take now from what the Minister of Municipal Affairs has said that his department is in a position at the moment to verify and approve the budget of the Mount Pearl Town Council?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to approve the budget of Mount Pearl. There were six

MR. DINN:

items requested by the gentleman down in my accounting division. One of the items we had with respect to the arena and the funds from government, the other five items have not been answered and until we get those answers certainly I will not approve the budget.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: A question for the Minister of the Environment in view of the absence of the Minister of Health to whom I would have addressed this question had he been here. It is in connection with the number of calls I have received regarding St. George's School in Manuels. Apparently - I am only going by the calls I have received, Mr. Speaker - that is there has been a tremendous odor spreading throughout the school I am told, particularly Grades V and VI in the last week or two. I believe the school was closed down for at least one day. I am sure he is familiar with another school in the area where they had to - there was some disease in fact and the school had to close for a number of weeks, not the same school -but there is that fear there now for those parents who have students in St. George's School in Manuels. I am wondering if the minister would undertake first of all to tell me if he is aware of the problem there and secondly, if not would he be good enough to undertake an investigation to see what the problem is and if he, in his authority and jurisdiction feels together with the Minister of Health that the school should be closed, would he be prepared to take the necessary action to see that it is cured insofar as he can.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Environment.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, of course, I have heard of it, Sir, and I will certainly - what is the name of the school please?

MR. NOLAN: St. George's.

MR. MURPHY: And for the information of the House my phone number is 737-2574 if anybody wants to ask any questions pertaining. I would like to hear these things and let us check the thing. So I will send around a copy of my phone number to all the members of the House so that they can contact me in my office when I can handle the

MR. MURPHY:

thing properly, perhaps not here at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile followed by the hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Mines and Energy what plans the government has to soften the blow of the increased gasoline and heating fuel, the increases that are going to come into effect tomorrow?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to devise ways and means to soften the blow because what that means is to provide some kind of financial assistance to consumers to relieve the kind of burden that they are going to be under with these new increases. The federal government through its agency the Anti-Inflation Board has allowed the increases that are now coming into effect. It is part of the new pricing policy that has been instituted by the federal government, and perhaps the only way that we can ease the blow is to defeat the present government that is in Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary to the original question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this government imposes some pretty heavy taxes on gasoline and heating fuel. Would the minister indicate to the House whether or not the government have taken any decision on dropping the tax on gasoline in order to soften the blow to the consumers in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, a number of years ago this government, primarily through the insistence of the present Premier, indicated on a whole bunch of occasions that it was our intention to try to alleviate taxation as it applied to heating oil, clothing and so on and we succeeded in bringing in those rather humane policies. If the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) wishes to see a reduction in health care in this Province, if he wishes to see a reduction in the quality of education in this Province, if he wishes to see a reduction -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

MR. PECKFORD: - in the quality of transportation, then we can reduce the gas.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

X When order is called although most hon. members like to be able to finish their sentence - and that is quite understandable - if it is not insisted upon and applied rigidly that a person does in fact then stop speaking and sit down, then that particular requirement which I think is a necessary one will be somewhat ambiguous in its application, and that is something which would have very serious consequences and should not be done. That is the most important point to be made.

My original interjection was to draw to the hon. minister's attention that the rules which apply to the Question and Answer Period apply equally to hon. members answering as they do to hon. members questioning and preclude debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

X MR. NEARY: My supplementary question is to the Minister of Social Services, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the same subject. Is the minister going to take steps to see that those people who live or who are forced to exist on social assistance, on fixed incomes, will get an increase in their allowances to offset the increase in heating fuel that is coming into effect tomorrow?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. BRETT: I am sure that question was asked in this House, about ten times last year, Sir.

MR. NEARY: And it will be asked, ten more times this year.

MR. BRETT: And I give the same answer now as I gave last year. That when the budget is brought down, everyone will know whether or not there will be an increase in the rate of social assistance.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: The original questioner with a supplementary. This will be the last supplementary.

MR. NEARY: To be more specific, perhaps the minister misunderstood me. At the moment I am talking about heating fuel. Will the minister grant those people who are forced to live on social assistance, the halt and the lame, an increase in their allowances to offset the increase in heating fuel?

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I can only answer that as I answered before, there was an overall increase in the cost of living throughout the province during the past year, and as I said, when the budget comes down, the House will know as will the province, whether or not there will be an increase in the rate of social assistance.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. I wonder if the minister could clear up something that a lot of communities have been wondering about. I wonder if he could tell us what the present policy is with respect to the incorporation of towns and communities, and whether any new ones are going to be incorporated, and whether any have been incorporated within the past twelve months?

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, basically the incorporations, or new incorporations have been held up because of the Whalen Commission Report and the Henley Commission Report. We are at present looking at those requests for incorporations, and proceeding where they have the requirement for incorporation. I might make a comment

MR. DINN: while I am up , Mr. Speaker, with respect to Burnt Islands. That will be one of the incorporations in the very near future.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, it is tied in with the first question that I asked, and that is ; Have there been any new incorporations within the past twelve months? You know, can the minister recall or recollect.

MR. DINN: Yes, outside of, Mr. Speaker, the new municipality of Buchans, the Local Improvement District of Buchans, I am not aware of any.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. Hon. member for Windsor-Buchans. I am sorry I have recognized the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans for a supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, indicating that Buchans was the only new incorporation this past year. Would the minister advise the House as to whether there was any request from the town of Buchans for that incorporation.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the incorporation of Buchans as a Local Improvement District was as a result of the Task Force report, and the hon. member for Buchans was on a sub-committee of that Task Force which recommended that incorporation.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. This will be the last question.

MR. NEARY: Did I understand the minister correctly? The minister stated that Burnt Islands will be incorporated into a town council in the very near future. That the minister now has cabinet approval to go ahead and grant a town council to the people of Burnt Islands.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, with respect to Burnt Islands, we had a request in from the people of Burnt Islands, they have met all the requirements for incorporation , I said we would have incorporation

MR. DINN:

in the next couple of months or so, several incorporations, one of the ones we are looking at is Burnt Islands. Hopefully that will be one of the ones that will be incorporated as a town council.

MR. NEARY: An order in connection with Burnt Islands, is it?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. Order 1, Address in Reply the adjourned debate on the amendment, thereto. Hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, now that the members that I was throwing the special bouquets to, are in the House, and were not yesterday. I should like to repeat again, that I did offer congratulations to the member from Exploits, who was here yesterday when I spoke, but also to the member for Bonavista North and the member for Ferryland. Without repeating them, I would refer them to the Hansard for some very choice words on the subject. Mr. Speaker, I believe it was the Minister of Industrial Development a couple of Wednesdays ago, when he was speaking in the private motion, the debate on the private motion concerning Labrador, brought in by my colleague from Eagle River. I believe it was he, the minister of Industrial and Rural Development, who

MR. SIMMONS: characterized the government as tomorrow people, and he characterized the Opposition among other things as today people. Tomorrow people, today people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe the minister was a lot closer to the truth, a lot nearer the mark than he realized when he chose to characterize us as today people and his colleagues as tomorrow people. The best proof of that of course, Mr. Speaker, at least insofar as the government is concerned is this document itself. It is certainly in every sense of the word a tomorrow document, a tomorrow document. It says very little, Mr. Speaker, about what they are going to do about the problems of today.

The first Prime Minister of Canada, Sir John A. MacDonald -

MR. NEARY: A good Tory.

MR. SIMMONS: - a good Tory, I am reminded, but he is known for other things, Mr. Speaker. He was known among other things for being known as Old Tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Old Man Tomorrow.

MR. SIMMONS: Old Man Tomorrow, and for very good reasons, if he believed absolutely and completely in that dictum that you should never do today what you can put off until tomorrow and you should never do tomorrow what you can put off for the next day. And you should not do then what you can put off for forever. He was the expert procrastinator of the 1870's. He had it down to a science, Mr. Speaker, that people thought could not be excelled, they thought could not be excelled. But how wrong they were. Because one century later, one century after Old Man Tomorrow of the 1870's we have an Old Tomorrow of the 1970's. We have several of them really but epitomized, Mr. Speaker, by the Premier, the leader of the team, our modern day Old Tomorrow, the Old Tomorrow of the 1970's, the man who would put Sir John to shame, would make Sir John look like an absolute amateur when it comes to procrastination, a babe in the woods when you compare the

MR. SIMMONS: ability at procrastinating, at dreaming about tomorrow, at iffing.

MR. HICKMAN: Maybe tomorrow.

MR. SIMMONS: Our modern Old Tomorrow, our Premier, would make Sir John look like an amateur, a very poor amateur. Of course now, Mr. Speaker, had we the time it would be an interesting exercise to compare Sir John and our present Premier at some length because they had other inclinations in common.

But, Mr. Speaker, I believe in fairness, I believe any comparison at length of these two people would be most unkind, that is to Sir John A. MacDonald. Our modern day Old Tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, our very own Premier is everything the term implies. He is the master at putting it off. He not only believes in the dictum that you should never do today what you can put off until tomorrow, but with him, in his five years in office it has reached new heights of perfection, he has perfected the dictum. With him it has become a specialty, a creed if you like. And what is this creed? Ah ha the creed is very simple. One, the water supply promised in the Fall of 1973, as it happens during a by-election, a coincidence I am sure, The water system promised to the people of MacCallum "before the Winter sets in", by the Premier. There is his creed. The water system promised to the people of MacCallum will be done, will be provided tomorrow. The trawler fleet promised the people of Harbour Breton and all the people along the Southwest Coast in 1971, the twenty trawlers -

CAPTAIN WINSOR: Sixty-five footers.

MR. SIMMONS: Twenty sixty-five footers promised in 1971, which got down to six in the by-election of 1973, these will be provided the creed says, will be provided tomorrow. The full employment promised by the Premier in the Fall of 1971, not Mr. Speaker, reduced unemployment, not

Mr. Simmons:

10 per cent instead of a 15 per cent or 17 per cent, but full employment. Now, Mr. Speaker, you would have be almost a raving maniac to promise that any way. Because there is not a jurisdiction in North America, even Alberta which province we have heard about in such kind terms today, even Alberta has got an unemployment rate of 2 per cent or 3 per cent, because it is virtually impossible given almost any set of circumstances however favourable, economically, and financially, it is virtually impossible to have full employment, zero unemployment, 100 per cent employment. Notwithstanding our Old Tomorrow was never phased by the facts, never taken off stride by the reality, he promised it any way, Mr. Speaker, and his creed is simple, full employment will be provided, will be achieved tomorrow, tomorrow.

Ah, yes, this modern day Old Tomorrow, of course, has had five years practising, practising mind you at the expense of the taxpayers of this Province. Not only at their financial expense in terms of tax dollars, but at their economic expense, at their social expense as a people, at the social and economic expense of everyone of us in this Chamber and in this Province, he has practised his art of procrastination, his art of doing nothing today, and promising the sky tomorrow.

Now, Mr. Speaker, like any artist, like any person who gets beyond the beginning phases of his career as an artist he introduces certain little shadings, little nuances, little differences, little specialties of his art. He gets bored with the basic practice of his art, the basic pursuit, the basic performance of his art, and so he begins to introduce little twists, a little specialized twist on the art he is pursuing. And no longer does he just say I am going to put that off until tomorrow, not this fellow, because this fellow is a real accomplished artist. He is an Old Tomorrow like you would not believe. He has got it down pat. No longer does he say about any problem, we will just put it off until tomorrow. Here is what he says, "Ah" for example, he says, "The Labrador issue, the frustrations, the dissatisfaction, the needs that demand to be filled,

Mr. Simmons:

I am not just going to put that off until tomorrow.' I think this requires some special artistic treatment. I will appoint a royal commission." That will effectively put it off until tomorrow.

So he appoints a royal commission, and two or three years later, and tens upon tens of thousands of dollars later, after one of the most expensive royal commissions in Newfoundland history, tomorrow comes, tomorrow comes. Here he is red-handed with six volumes of a report he can scarcely lift. So what does he do now? Very simple, like every artist when you are stuck for a trick, you return to the basic practice of your profession. And so in very simple unadulterated terms he just puts it off until tomorrow by shelving the report. So nothing has been done about that since the day our good friend Mr. Snowden made the report available to government. And that, Mr. Speaker, is just one of so many examples that could be given.

What about the problems of the small community, the small unincorporated community? I mentioned a moment ago the community of MacCullum without water. I could mention Francois in my district, Grey River in my district, St. Joseph's Cove in my district, St. Veronica's in my district, five unincorporated communities between a couple of hundred and three hundred population, all of them without the basic conveniences that we in the larger towns and cities take for granted. Why are they without these conveniences, Mr. Speaker, because they are lazier than we are? Because they have not got the get up and go? Because they earn less money per capita? Because they do not know how to use the bathroom? No, Mr. Speaker, because this government will not allow these communities to incorporate. And we heard it again this afternoon, not twenty minutes ago from the Minister of Municipal Affairs. My colleague from Lewisporte (Mr. White)

MR. SIMMONS:

asked the question about when the last community was incorporated. Apart from Buchans, which my colleagues had to remind him of, which does not say much for his regard for Buchans, apart from that one he cannot remember a single one. I will tell you why, because there is not a single one, because for four years the McCallums and the St. Josephs and the St. Veronica's and the Grey Rivers and the Francois's and the dozens of other communities in that category have been disbarred, have been disallowed, have been not permitted to incorporate and thereby to begin helping themselves to provide some of the basic services that we, in other communities, take so much for granted.

Now, what did the Old Tomorrow do about that problem? What did our modern day Old Tomorrow, our very own Premier, do about that problem? Here is what he did. He said, "Let us appoint a Royal Commission. That will effectively put it on ice for three or four years. That will give us a good excuse." So four years later his newest Minister of Municipal Affairs - and I must say that department has a fairly high mortality rate - even our new one now up in March 1, 1977 is able to rise and give the same excuse that his predecessor and the one before him and the one before him were able to give. "We are waiting on the Whalen Royal Commission actually and that has caused us a bit of delay and that kind of thing. And McCallum in the meantime I will tell you what to do, get aboard the boat like you have done for forty or fifty years some nice cold morning in February or March and three or four of you will row out around the point a couple of miles if you can skote the punt out over the ice to the edge of the ice in the harbour, row it around the point a couple of miles, get the water from a Spring and put it in a puncheon, in a large barrel, and then bring it into the edge of the ice and then with a hoop and a couple of buckets drag it in across the ice and up to the house and hope it is still fit to drink. That is the solution.

Mr. Speaker, what has he done about the problems up in McCallum and the other small communities? A Royal Commission which effectively shelves it. But I say to him and to his government, Tomorrow has come

MR. SIMMONS:

and the people of McCallum still skote their water in the same way and the people of Francois still have a water system which got government's attention only during the last election and not a bit since. Now as they go around the community, yes they have a water system all right and they also have one of the most novel recreational exercises in Newfoundland, ducking the sprays from the water system because everywhere you go you have one massive fountain all the way from the top of the brook all the way down to the community with its several forks, its several hoses going off all boxed in and that kind of thing, and water sprouts everywhere because the system was never finished. Because after September, 1975 when the election was over there was no immediate priority to finish it anymore. So they duck their fountains and get recreation in the meantime but no water. That is what Old Tomorrow says about the small community, "We will deal with them, we will solve their problems tomorrow."

How about the future of Buchans? Now there is a classic. If you want to see how the art of putting things off until tomorrow reached absolute and undeniable perfection, you look at the Buchans example. Or if you are not familiar with it you ask any soul in Buchans regardless of political stripe.

MR. HICKEY: How many royal commissions have we set up?

MR. SIMMONS: I am going to tell the minister how many royal commissions they have set up because I have got them all right there.

MR. HICKEY: Let us hear about them.

MR. SIMMONS: I will tell the minister all that in a moment. I do not expect the minister to like what I am saying about Buchans because the people of Buchans do not like it. I do not expect the Minister of Tourism to like it.

SOME HON. MEMBEPS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: The Minister of Tourism wants to hear about reports? Perhaps he wants to hear about this report. It has some very interesting things about the minister, some said and some not quite said. I will tell the minister in time about that. But that is another

MR. SIMMONS:

story and a long story and a sad story. If I were the minister I would bite my lip a bit because that one there, Mr. Speaker -

MR. HICKEY: What story?

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I do not expect the minister to like what I am saying. The truth often hurts particularly when it is the kind of truth that I am telling about what this government has done to the people of Buchans. If only, Mr. Speaker, if it were

Mr. Simmons.

only the sin of omission, if it were only the sin of putting it off, but the callous, almost animal-like treatment that those people have been subjected to in the interests of some fellow practicing his art, in the interests of some fellow trying to be the Mr. Perfect Old Man Tomorrow. And he has just about achieved it on the back of the taxpayers of this Province, and in particular the taxpayers of Buchans. However, Mr. Speaker, if Buchans is not a relevant example for some people, how about in my own district, in Bay d'Espoir? Shall I tell you how he practiced his art in Bay d'Espoir, in the Fall of 1973, which again you remember they tell me there was a by-election down there. I am not suggesting there is any connection between the by-election and what I am going to say. But the by-election was called in October 1973, and in November 1973 just before the by-election was actually run off - November 26 was the actual date - just before that, Mr. Speaker, "Old Tomorrow" himself announced that they were going to have a special report, because they were concerned about the economic development of Bay d'Espoir. They were concerned that it had one of the highest unemployment rates in Newfoundland and Labrador. They were going to do something about it, pronto, right now. And so they appointed the Research and Productivity Council in New Brunswick, known in short as RPC. RPC came in and did, Mr. Speaker, a magnificent report, and it was delivered to the government in January, and you will recall in this House, I tried for two and one-half months - I knew the report existed - and I tried for two and one-half months, before I got the present Minister of Finance, then the Minister of Industrial Development, to admit that the report actually existed. They sat on it for two or three months. And finally in April, 1974 it was made available to me.

Since April, 1974, Mr. Speaker, they have sat on it, and not one job has been created as a result of that report, not one solitary, single job, Mr. Speaker. What did they do for the people of Bay d'Espoir? The same treatment all the time, Mr. Speaker. Even

Mr. Simmons.

a practiced, perfectionist artist becomes mundane after awhile, because he does the same thing over and over. However beautiful to the ear or the eye, it is the same thing, and you can recognize the pattern. You can sit down in your living room and you can listen to music, and you can tell whether it is Beethoven or Shubert or whoever, because however expert it has a style all its own, and so with this Premier, Mr. Speaker, an artist with a style completely his own and, therefore, very recognizable, and, therefore, we see him to do the same thing to the people of Labrador as he did to the people of Buchans, as he did to the people of the small communities I mentioned, as he did to the people of Bay d' Expoir, because his performance, his course of action is predictable. Put it off until tomorrow. If tomorrow comes, find a way of putting it off until another tomorrow. And so we could go, Mr. Speaker.

The Lower Churchill - the Upper Churchill, there is a classic one, the Upper Churchill. Now how, Mr. Speaker, you ask, how did they put that one off until tomorrow? Somebody, Mr. Speaker, had the bright idea that if we could spark a confrontation, if we could box people into corners, we would have two things going for us at once. A beautiful patriotic election issue for three by-elections in June 1976 - forget the expense to the people of the Province financially or morally - but what a beautiful election issue we would have if we turned this into a patriotic confrontation, and at the same time, so we do not have to deal with it right after the election, shove it in the courts. What better excuse in the books, Mr. Speaker, than I cannot talk about it, because it is in the courts. And this government, Mr. Speaker, and this Old Tomorrow has become an expert. You hear it three times a day in this House. I cannot answer that one it is in the courts. I would say, Mr. Speaker, this government has more cases in the courts than any other government in Canadian history, I would think,

Mr. Simmons.

more things they cannot talk about or will not talk about, and perhaps there is the crux, Mr. Speaker, or will not talk about it. Because you see by getting this thing in the court, with nebulous results, Mr. Speaker, even if the court decides in their favour, what is the court going to decide? The court is going to decide that in 1983 we will get some more power. Now, Mr. Speaker, it happens to be 1977. I think I speak for a lot of people in this Province when I say that what the people of this Province would much rather have than more power in 1983 is a considerably improved financial position in 1977. That is hardly possible, Mr. Speaker, if you have a government that engages in tomorrow ploys,

MR. SIMMONS:

tomorrow games , whatever the consequences to its people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if what I said about our modern day

Old Tomorrow is true, if he has been procrastinating at the expense of the people of Bay D'Espoir and the people of McCallum, and Francois, and Gray River, and Ramea and Burgeo, every community in my district, and the expense of the people of Buchans, and at the expense of the people of this entire province, if all that that I say is true, how is it, Mr. Speaker, how well our artists, our procrastinator, our accomplished artist, our modern Tchaikovsky, how will he ever, Mr. Speaker, perpetuate his own memory? How will we remember such a great artist? Ah but, Mr. Speaker, he has looked after that to. I think it was about Sir Christopher Wren that this line was first said, I cannot say the latin, I will that to my more learned colleagues in the House, but the English, which you will find over the North door, of that very great cathedral in London, St. Pauls, as you go in the north entrance and look from the inside back at the door, as I had the occasion to do, and see that inscription in Latin, the epitaph to Sir, Christopher Wren, the great English architect, of the 17th and early 18th century, the inscription is in Latin but the English equivalent I am told is "If you seek his monument, look about you" If you seek his monument, look about you. Mr. Speaker, I now compare our modern day Old Tomorrow to a second knight, first Sir. John and now Sir Christopher.

He is going to get heady feelings, Mr. Speaker, when he hears this, but, Mr. Speaker, even the connotation of the White Knight, in shining armour can be carried to far. If you seek a monument, look around you. Let us look around us , Mr. Speaker, Within arms reach, I looked this afternoon. I talked about the Royal Commission on Labrador, there is his monument, Mr. Speaker, volume 1, The Royal Commission on Labrador, if that is not enough, there is a monument, Volume 2;

MR. SIMMONS:

Volume 3, Mr. Speaker, there are monuments, words, Volume 4 of the Labrador report, Volume 5, and Volume 6 which includes, Mr. Speaker, among other things, no fewer than 288 recommendations.

When the former member for Labrador North was in this House, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mel Woodward, he and I got involved in our own little project to do certain things involving the Labrador issue. And we wrote letters to the Ministers, Mr. Speaker, on every single one of those 288 recommendations, and we said look, the Royal Commission recommended in recommendation number 231 that your department do this, could you inform us of the status of that recommendation, what you intend doing or what you have done.

One minister of the seventeen or eighteen over there, Mr. Speaker, and at the time some of them might have been in Scandinavia or Montreal or somewhere else, God knows where, but there were a few kicking around the province at the time, Mr. Speaker. They might have been down in Grey River helicopter fishing, up in Labrador fishing or down in Placentia Bay fishing, doing a variety of things, all kinds of varieties of fishing, when they were not shooting partridge or moose or whatever.

Well, Mr. Speaker, one minister, the former member for St. John's West, Mr. John Crosbie, the only minister who answered. Now there were two or three who answered, standard acknowledgements. "I got your letter and I will answer it tomorrow." But one minister only gave us an answer of substance and I will say to that man's credit that he documented every item we had asked, and he gave a response. Now we were not happy with all the responses, but at least we knew the status of the recommendation, we knew that he was aware of what was in the Commission Report, the only minister. The other sixteen or seventeen did not even bother, with two or three exceptions, to give an acknowledgement to the member for Labrador North, as he then was, Mr. Woodward, or me.

Mr. Simmons:

There are his monuments, Mr. Speaker, there are the monuments of this government, in the summary of that report, again, another pretty colour. There is his monument, the Royal Commission on Municipal Government, one of the greatest monuments, Mr. Speaker, because it has been the excuse for more tomorrows than any other document, more communities are suffering today, and more people are going to outdoor toilets today, still going to outdoor toilets, more people are drinking filthy drinking water and running the risk of becoming ill because of the tomorrow that that report represents than for any other reason related to this government.

Mr. Speaker, look some monuments are not nearly as striking or as beautiful as others, but is that not something? Is that not a classic? The Buchans Task Force Report, there, Mr. Speaker, if he is forgotten for all of the other reasons the people of Buchans will have a special place in their heart forever for Old Tomorrow because of this. I never said a kind place, but a very special place.

The Lower Chruchill - what monuments they are, beautiful orange, Mr. Speaker. Look, here we are, Mr. Speaker, is that not an impressive monument? Would you not like to have one that prominent as your epitaph? Or would you not even like to have the money it costs as my colleague from Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) so well says? I doubt whether any of us, however great we will be seen in the eyes of our colleagues or our friends or our family, will ever get a monument to us that cost a couple of hundred million dollars. Boy what a long, tall, straight monument, cairn, pile of stones you can build with that.

The people of Bay d'Espoir, Mr. Speaker, go for green monuments. They have their reasons. The RPC report, the ultimate tomorrow document, there are his monuments, Mr. Speaker, there they are. I have only got a small desk so I could not bring in all the monuments that one should parade out in honour of such an accomplished artist. I could not pay as complete a tribute to the perfection of this artist as I would like to, but as is always the

Mr. Simmons:

case on a funereal occasions, it is difficult to have complete presence of mind. It is difficult in the face of such shameful, regrettable, remorseful, tearful circumstances to have your wits completely about you. There are his monuments, Mr. Speaker, some of them. There are others. I could not bring them all here. Had I a truck I would have brought the one from Clarenville, that beautiful four by eight billboard which says that the Clarenville Hospital is beginning. I would have brought the one from Grand Falls which says that the Central Newfoundland Hospital is going to be expanded, or the one from the Burin Peninsula.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Ah, yes, all projects that have been begun several times and stopped just as many times, always at convenient periods, Mr. Speaker. Some people tell me that a start takes place just before elections and the stop takes place just after elections. Well now, Mr. Speaker, that cannot be the case certainly. Or the monument, Mr. Speaker, of the Wild Life Act if you want more intangible monuments, the Wild Life Act which has two applications one for those in high office and one for the rest of us. Or The Public Tendering Act which has two applications, one when you are telling the public how it should have been done under the old administration, and another when you decide how it is going to be done under yours, with no public tenders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Because you see the ultimate monument to this government, to this Old Tomorrow Mr. Speaker, would be two monuments representing the double talk of this administration.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that the other ultimate monument is a complete lack of confidence in public officials. Now, Mr. Speaker, our Old Tomorrow did not begin this, he did not start the trend but I will tell you this, Mr. Speaker, he has confirmed all the worse fears, he has certainly confirmed all the worse fears, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, the Minister of Industrial Development was indeed right when he says that this is a tomorrow government and the Opposition is a today people. And we make no apologies, Mr. Speaker, for being called today people. We believe that today must we be concerned about the economic stability of this Province. Today must we address ourselves to the direction in which we are headed as a people. Today must we have a close scrutiny of what is happening in rural Newfoundland and Labrador. Today must we hear the voice of Labrador and heed it while there is time to heed it. Today must we come to grips with record unemployment and the highest welfare roles in our history. Today must we be concerned about the shocking malaise which is among our people right throughout this Province. Today must we be concerned with the lack of confidence about the parliamentary system.

So we over here are going to bear the scorn, Mr. Speaker, we will bear the scorn of being called today people, a scorn I believe gladly shared by all the people of this Province, all those who cry out for something to be done today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I do not advocate a today mentality which screams out tomorrow, which takes no thought for tomorrow, but I shun, Mr. Speaker, I reject outright a mentality which gazes fixedly on tomorrow as our Old Tomorrow does without any reference to doing anything today.

Mr. Speaker, on opening day the Premier got up and

MR. SIMMONS: he exhorted all of us to hard work, hard work. How appropriate that the exhortation should be given. How appropriate that we should have an exhortation to hard work. Is there anybody in this Chamber who can disagree with that? How appropriate. How completely inappropriate that the exhortation should come from the lips of the man who happens to be Premier today. I say from the lips, Mr. Speaker, because it can be nothing more than lip service to an ideal, rather than a clarion call to some renewed endeavour. A drunk Mr. Speaker, preaching sobriety would have more credibility than our Premier preaching the virtues of hard work.

How can you, Mr. Speaker, lead a government, how can you lead a government sitting on a salmon river in Labrador? How can you, Mr. Speaker, lead a government delegation in Scandinavia?

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: How can you, Mr. Speaker, lead a government delegation in Scandinavia, your four Cabinet Ministers, lead them to Scandinavia by sitting in London all the two weeks that they are gone? How can you, Mr. Speaker, lead a people to mount a redoubled effort, how can you lead a people to mount a redoubled effort if they see in your every act of leadership a complete, a blatant betrayal of your very exhortation to hard work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SIMMONS: The Premier is right, Mr. Speaker, there are attitudes abroad that are pretty disturbing, attitudes about ease and about despair and about gloom and doom and what is the use and that kind of thing, Mr. Speaker. The Premier and his colleagues did not invent those attitudes but they have certainly made them acceptable. They have made it respectable to rest on your oars. They have made it embraceable as it were,

MR. SIMMONS: so that today the gospel of gloom and doom is a respectable gospel these days, thanks to the Premier and Mr. Crosbie. The gospel of ease, of the free ride—I was not referring to the jet to Montreal, Mr. Speaker—the gospel of the free ride is acceptable it seems these days, thanks to the example of the Premier and his administration.

Because you see, Mr. Speaker, what we have on our hands here is a devil-may-care, a despairing, a gloom and doom, a lazy government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not have all the solutions. The solutions are not simple. But I would suggest that a beginning can be made and I would suggest a couple of things as a beginning. Number one, stay home, stay home and do the work that is assigned to you., or resign and let somebody else do it. We are sick and tired of part-time governments and part-time Premiers in this Province, Mr. Speaker. We want a full time administration for a change. Stay home.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! I do have to remind the hon. member that his time has just about expired.

MR. SIMMONS: Can I take a sentence?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. MURPHY: Hurry up now and have another sentence.

MR. SIMMONS: Just to clue up, Mr. Speaker, number one, stay home, and number two, practice what you preach. Practice good fiscal management. Practice good

Mr. Simmons.

economic leadership. Use the public tendering system, and this Province would be a whole lot better for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I want to join my other colleagues in wishing very sincere congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply. Both gentlemen did an exceptionally good job. The member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) excelled himself in his maiden speech as did the member, my good friend and colleague from Bonavista North (Mr. Cross). I am not going to waste the time that I have allotted to me, Mr. Speaker, to reply to some of the charges made by the previous speaker. I think the fact that he devoted his entire speech to castigating the Premier of the Province and referring to the government as being a tomorrow government - was it? - or a yesterday government, I think, proved just how bankrupt the man is, when it comes to trying to get across new ideas. It can have some worth-while effect in the future development of our Province.

MR. SIMMONS: You are on the verge of bankruptcy.

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): A point of order has been raised.

MR. PECKFORD: The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir is interrupting the present speaker, and I am sure that the speaker, the hon. Minister of Fisheries would like to be heard in silence. It is a brazen breach of the rules. We gave him the courtesy of silence, and he should do the same for our side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more with the Minister of Mines and Energy that one should be heard in silence. I understand - to the point of order - that if the member speaking allows some latitude, then it is okay to have an exchange. And I understood he was doing it in the spirit in which I did it when I was subjected to about ten minutes of harassment by the member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order, please!

Hon. members will recognize that if a member requests silence during his address, the House accords him that courtesy. On the other hand if he does not specifically request such silence, and the House does not become unduly unruly, the Chair will allow a certain amount of talk back and forth.

The hon. minister.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I would want the House to note by the way that during the hon. member's speech, I did not interject, I did not interrupt him at any time, and I expect the same courtesy from him.

I am not going to, like I said, waste the time of the House or the time that has been allocated to me to speak in this debate by even attempting to respond to some of the nonsense, the utter nonsense that has been put forward by the hon. member, negative attitudes that I am sure we can very well do without in this Province. I want to spend the time that I have, Mr. Speaker, talking about the state of the fishing industry, what has happened during 1976, and what we hope to see happen during the year ahead. I have already indicated to the House, Mr. Speaker, that 1976 was probably a bumper year for the fishing industry. Last April, I think it was, I predicted that on the basis of landings to that time that 1976 would be a very successful year in the fishing industry. I am happy now to relate that such was the case. In fact 1976 was a very successful year. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, I should, for the record, place some of the statistics before the House as to what happened in 1976. Total landings were up by twenty-three per cent, for a total of 659,000,000 pounds. The landed value of our fish for that year was up by twenty-eight point five per cent for a total of \$59 million. The export value was a record one. It was up by

MR. W. CARTER:

thirty-two point two per cent to a total of \$160 million, as compared to the previous record year of 1973 which was then \$144 million. Cod fish landings, inshore, were up by thirty-nine per cent, with the landed value increasing by approximately

MR. W. CARTER: approximately forty-seven per cent. I think it is encouraging, Mr. Speaker, as well to note that the 16,500 fishermen who were involved in the fisheries in 1976 increased their earnings by eighteen per cent. And that I think is probably one of the greatest increases in any segment of our Provincial economy for that year.

The processing sector employed a labour force of approximately 6,000 people up by 22.4 per cent over the previous year. The number of licenced fishermen in 1976 were 18,000, which was up by about thirty-two per cent over the 1975 figure, despite the fact that our total labour force in the Province increased by only 3.9 per cent, making a total for people involved in the fishing industry in Newfoundland in 1976 as that of 15.5 per cent as opposed to 12.43 per cent in 1975.

Mr. Speaker, these are impressive increases in landings and landed values and earnings to fishermen. While I am not suggesting that we should be now content to rest on our oars and relax, we must keep progressing and trying our best to ensure that the average landing to fishermen continue to increase, indeed to a point where they would be able to sustain the quality of life that is taken for granted by most other Canadians in other industries.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to try and take credit for these increased landings. But I think the department can take some credit for having provided the necessary tools for the fishermen to catch the fish once the good Lord sent in to our shores. For example in 1976 we had completed several marine service centres around the Island, Wesleyville, Bonavista, Harbour Grace, Port Saunders, Old Perlican, Englee, LaScie, Labrador

MR. W. CARTER: South, Flowers Cove, Durrell, Fogo Island, Southern Harbour, and Isle aux Morts, for a total provincial expenditure of \$3.6 million.

These centres, Mr. Speaker, are -

MR. SMALLWOOD: What are these?

MR. W. CARTER: These are marine service centres.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How many?

MR. W. CARTER: There are about fourteen altogether in the Province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the minister yield a moment? Before I went out I had arranged, my colleagues and I, for a number of them, I do not remember what the number was, would the minister tell me how many were our planning and how many - not how many were built, that we built, I imagine the present government built pretty well all of them - but how many did we announce and how many are there in addition to that number?

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I give the hon. former Premier credit for having maybe initiated the programme but I am afraid that a lot of the initiation was by way of planning and talk but the present government, I am happy to say, is responsible for, at least, implementing some of these plans.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Perhaps that is so. Yes.

MR. W. CARTER: These centres, Mr. Speaker, are used for the purpose of storing and repairing boats, repairing and reconstructing nets, or the overhauling and rebuilding of engines, a very useful purpose.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well they are actually superb, are they not? Magnificent beyond words.

MR. W. CARTER: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, they are one of the great innovations, the great new concepts in the inshore fishery that we have seen in the past couple of decades.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right.

MR. W. CARTER: 1976 saw the construction of several community fish handling facilities. I am thinking about Little Harbour East, Musgrave Harbour, Branch, St. Mary's - The Capes which involved an expenditure of \$1.1 million. Community stages in Red Bay and other parts of the Province, including Bartlett's Harbour, and several of these stages were upgraded in 1976 at a cost of, I do not have the exact amount but at a considerable cost to the Provincial Treasury.

Ice making machines, cooling units and other ice making facilities were installed in six other areas with upgrading of

MR. W. CARTER:

six cooling units along the South coast. And 1976 saw nine freshwater supply systems in the Province to fish plants totalling \$6.1 million with a total provincial expenditure of \$1.3 million. This, of course, will improve the quality of fish and of course by so doing will increase the value of fish processed and sold. In 1976 we saw the development of the pelagic fisheries, projects were undertaken at Bonavista, Valleyfield, Twillingate, Wesleyville, Fogo, Triton and St. Anthony. Very successful results were effected. For example, crews in the St. Anthony area who started fishing pelagics on September 21 and ended in mid October landed 500,000 pounds representing additional earnings of \$20,000 with almost a similar amount being earned by people who work in the processing plants.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and give a number of examples as to why the fish landings were increased in 1976 and why the earnings of our fishermen were increased proportionately. In the marketing division of the Department of Fisheries we had a very busy and a very successful year. The marketing people were involved in assisting the community of Greenspond which is involved in a salmon smoking operation, crab processing, seal canning, minced salt fish, mackerel canning, squid processing and herring pickling. Similar experiments were undertaken, Mr. Speaker, in Fortune Bay where Danish seines could be used, and as a result turbot found in the Hermitage Bay and Fortune Bay area which was otherwise unknown and does have some potential for our future developments in the years ahead.

We provided electronic training for fishermen during the Summer to assist them in the operation and maintenance of electronic equipment. On the job training for six or eight fishermen from Port Saunders, Flower's Cove, for ten fishermen from the St. Mary's Bay, Trinity Bay and Conception Bay areas.

Another very important advance, Mr. Speaker, during the year 1976 was in the activities of the Fisheries Loan Board. For example, in 1976 the Loan Board was responsible for loaning out to fishermen a total

MR. W. CARTER:

of \$8.5 million with 803 applications being approved. That compared with the total outlay in 1975 of \$5.4 million or 408 applications.

Another interesting statistic, Mr. Speaker, which I am sure will delight my friends opposite is the fact that seventy-seven per cent of the loans that have been made by the Loan Board have been made since the present administration took office in 1972, and that thirty-five per cent of all of the money that has been put out by that Loan Board has been put out since 1976. So you can see there is a very dramatic increase there in the activities of the Fisheries Loan Board.

Another very important statistic is that the average age of our fishermen has decreased by ten years in the past four years. For example, the average age of our fishermen has decreased from forty-five to thirty-five years of age in the past four years. That I think speaks well for the industry and the fact that a lot of our young people are getting more involved in the industry itself.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is just a very brief rundown of the activities of the Department of Fisheries during the past year, during 1976. Now I think we must spend a few minutes talking about what the future holds and where we are going in 1977. January 1, Mr. Speaker, 1977, I think, will go down in history as being one of the most important events in the history of our entire Province.

MR. W. CARTER: It was the declaration of a 200 mile limit, something that Newfoundlanders have been fighting for now for quite some time. And I think that Newfoundlanders can take pride in the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the fight for the 200 mile limit was initiated in this Province by Newfoundlanders, led by Newfoundlanders and because of pressure that was applied on the federal government by Newfoundlanders did they see fit to implement our recommendations on January 1st., of 1977.

Mr. Speaker, the 200 mile limit has some very significant benefits for this Province. Number one it will ensure that the Newfoundland fishing industry will survive. It means that the more than 300 Newfoundland communities that depend on the fisheries for their very existence will be now allowed to survive and I hope prosper. And probably what is more important, the 200 mile limit and the continuation of the fishing industry will ensure a continuation of our Newfoundland way of life which is envied by most people in other parts of the North American Continent.

It will represent to us, Mr. Speaker, an enormous opportunity for the future growth and development of our fishing industry. The outcome, I am convinced, will have a revolutionary effect on our people and on the social and economic life of our Province.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the pleasure, during the past eight months, of travelling pretty well to every major fishing area in the Province. I have gone to the four corners of the Province, including Labrador, where we have had a series of regional fisheries meetings, totalling in all fourteen.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. W. CARTER: During my travels I have witnessed what I think is a revolutionary trend amongst our fishermen. It is obvious

MR. W. CARTER: to me now, having travelled around the Province and having talked to many thousands of our fishermen, that they are much better equipped, much better financed, and have a much healthier attitude toward the fisheries and what is more important, Mr. Speaker, they are obviously determined now to have a much greater say in the affairs of their industry, in their community and their Province. And that I believe is a very important and a very healthy sign.

At these meetings, Mr. Speaker, we have given the fishermen a chance to express to us their concerns with what is happening in the industry, to pass on to us their ideas, suggestions, and in some cases, their criticisms. By the same token it has given our people, the staff of the Department of Fisheries, a chance to get around and to see first-hand what is happening in the Province and to listen first-hand to the fishermen and to their problems. And I can say this now in all sincerity that having had these fourteen meetings around the Province that my officials and I are much better equipped to deal with some of the problems that we have encountered and have a much better idea as to exactly what the fishing industry is all about, and what steps we must take to ensure that it improves and in so doing affords the people who are engaged in it a much greater chance to derive a decent living for themselves and their families.

DR. FARRELL: Hear! Hear!

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks and months we have heard a lot of talk about joint ventures, about foreign landings, West Germans, under-utilized plant capacity and maybe I can spend a moment or two explaining to the House exactly what our position is in these matters.

With the declaration of the 200 mile limit the total allowable catch in the Northwest Atlantic, in Northern areas has been established

Mr. W. Carter.

160,000 metric tons of fish, that is cod fish, 160,000 tons. In 1968, Mr. Speaker, in the same area, the total allowable catch was established by ICNAF at being 807,000 metric tons. I repeat, 807,000 metric tons in the ICNAF areas in 1968. In 1973 the total allowable catch was designated by ICNAF, which then was the governing body, at 354,509 metric tons. In 1975 the total allowable catch was established at 554,000 metric tons. In 1976, I believe, the total allowable catch was established at around 300,000 metric tons. I repeat, 1968, there were 807,000 metric tons; in 1973, 354,000 metric tons; 1975, 554,000 metric tons; 1976, 300,000 metric tons, and now in 1977, the total allowable catch has been established at 166,000 metric tons. So there has been a reduction from a high in 1968 of 807,000 tons to a low in 1977 of 166,000 metric tons.

MR. O'BRIEN: Would the hon. minister permit? Am I to understand, Sir, that in 1973 we had 354,000 metric tons and then in the following year 1974 it came up to 554,000?

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I can check my figures. It will take a little while to check this, but I will before I take my seat. I will confirm that figure.

MR. O'BRIEN : It looks like it went down and then it came up for one year and went down again the following year.

MR. W. CARTER: Yes, I think, Mr. Speaker, there might be - I shall get that information before I take my seat and correct it if it is false.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the point that I am trying to make is that, like I said, the total allowable catch of cod in these areas

Mr. W. CARTER:

has been drastically reduced . It has been determined by scientists, who are satisfied that a sufficient cushion has been built in to allow the stocks to replenish and to replenish themselves to where they were, say, prior to the great onslaught in that area prior to 1968.

So now, Mr. Speaker, you talk about joint ventures, co-operative fishing ventures. The conditions under which the 200 mile limit was declared was basically the unified text of the Law of the Sea Conference which stated that while the coastal states will have the right to manage and harvest the resources within their 200 mile limit, stocks that are surplus to that states needs will have to be allocated to foreign countries. That is one condition. And the second condition, Mr. Speaker, is that prior to the actual declaration of the 200 mile limit, that Canada had entered into five bilateral agreements with five ICNAF countries, Russia, Poland, Spain, I believe, Norway, Portugal, I think, and maybe one or two other countries in which it was agreed that stocks surplus to the Canadian catching effort would be allocated to these countries. So whether we like to believe it or not, whether we care to believe it or not, under these agreements, and under the terms and conditions under which the 200 mile limit was declared, Canada has very little choice - indeed it does not have any choice but to allow other countries to fish that portion of the total allowable catch that

MR. CARTER: and it has been designated as being surplus to the Canadian fishing effort.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that the case morally or is it part of the declaration by Canada and by other countries, the United States and I see Cuba has now done so. do they make it the legal rule, that you can fish if we let you, but you have no right unless we give you the right, is that the case?

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the ships that are fishing now within the Canadian 200 mile limit are doing so by leave and licence of this country, but under conditions that have been laid down by the Law of the Sea Conference, and consistent with the terms and conditions that have been laid down in the five bilateral agreements that have been signed with the other ICNAF countries.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman is very gracious for letting me interrupt him. What I would like to know, and I am sure the House would like to know, and maybe the rest of the House knows, but I do not, if Canada decided, with regard to a given stretch of water, that we are not going to do any fishing there ourselves, for we are not going to be ready to do it for a certain period of time, and we are not going to let anybody else do it, except for the morale condemnation there might be around the world, is there anything to stop Canada taking that position?

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the total allowable catch in 1977 was established by ICNAF, ICNAF, of course, as the hon. member knows is -

MR. SMALLWOOD: For 1977.

MR. CARTER: Yes, for 1977. -the International Commission of the North Atlantic Fisheries, made up of seventeen member nations around the world. The quotas for 1977 were established by that body because Canada, I presume, did not have time to get the necessary regime in place.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That was this year.

MR. CARTER: Yes for 1977.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And it ends this year.

MR. CARTER: Yes it ends this year. 1978, hopefully, Canada then will be able to set their own quota, and we will have first call to whatever has been designated by the scientists, as being the total allowable catch in that particular area.

Mr. Speaker, Canada is a very sensitive nation, and rightly so. It is very proud of its image around the world. It has been a fair and a responsible nation, in trading with the countries that are now almost begging, for the right to fish in that area for the stocks that are surplus to our needs. I do not think that Canada tomorrow, could adopt that "dog in the manager" attitude of saying, "Lood, even though the scientists will say that, you know, we can harvest a 160 or 180 thousand tons of fish in that area, that we are only going to allow to be caught what the Canadian effort can actually catch." And that I suggest would be probably what, less than 50 thousand or 60 thousand metric tons.

Now, maybe we can adopt that attitude, legally maybe we can, but morally, I do not think that Canada could afford that luxury. And as a Canadian I am not sure I would want my country to adopt that kind of an attitude. Bearing in mind, and being satisfied that these quotas are established by people who are highly qualified, competent people, scientists, I cannot question their judgement the Premier cannot, none of us can really, in all fairness, challenge their judgement. If they say that the present stocks will allow for a harvesting of 160 thousand metric tons, when then who am I to say no, it is wrong, it is only a 120 thousand.

Indeed, Dr. Arthur May, a brilliant young Newfoundland biologist only two days ago confirmed that fact during a meeting in Goose Bay with his minister. He is satisfied that the total allowable catch that was set by ICNAF in 1977, does in fact allow sufficient fish to

MR. CARTER:

remain to replemish and to conserve. And I do not think that any of us, can really question that judgement on their part. This is based on scientific information, scientific data, by people who are highly competent in that field, certainly more than we are.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I thank the minister for that reply, very useful, and very valuable reply to my question. May I ask him another question while he is on his feet and dealing with this matter of the fisheries? Young Mr. Russell, Hazen Russell's son, one of his two sons, made a speech somewhere, I heard it on the radio.

Mr. Smallwood:

on the radio. I heard quotations from it, to the effect (a) that our existing fleet of draggers is big enough and good enough for the next fourteen or fifteen years for the foreseeable increase in the catch because they have been taking only 40 per cent to 50 per cent of their capacity. And number, two, as to the general all round accuracy of that statement by Mr. Russell. And number three—and I do appreciate the minister's generosity in letting me trespass on his time this way, but I am trying to help the debate, I am not trying to hinder—the problem he raises of marketing. You know, if we do increase our total production which we need to do for the sake of the men fishing, for the sake of the shore plants and for the sake of the economy in general, but if we do how soon might we run into the problem of market? He suggests that it would be quite a problem.

MR. W. CARTER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I heard the comments of Mr. Russell and while I disagree with most of what he had to say I agree with some in that, and he said, and quite rightly so, that at the present time Newfoundland's catching effort offshore and inshore is utilized at about 50 per cent of its actual catching capability. For example, in the offshore fleet we have now about, I believe it is eighty-seven offshore ships, some twenty-seven side trawlers, and the balance are stern trawlers. These ships are capable of landing an average of 7.5 million pounds of fish a year based on twenty-six trips per year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Each ship?

MR. W. CARTER: Twenty-six, yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Each.

MR. W. CARTER: Each. But in fact they are landing about half that much. They are landing about 3.5 million pounds of fish a year on the basis of the same number of trips, which means that the total offshore fishing fleet is now operating at about 50 per cent of its real operating capability.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But these ships will get old. Surely it is all right to say this number, and you might have the same number fifteen years from now, but they might not be the same ship

MR. W. CARTER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting, Sir, that we can just be content now to rest on our oars, as it were, and to say, look we do not need to build ships because we have eighty-seven offshore ships, and they are capable of landing a half a billion pounds a year when in fact they are only landing 290 million pounds or something like that. Of course, we will have to replenish our offshore fleet as in fact, we are going to have to beef up and replenish the inshore fleet. But the timing is all important Mr. Speaker, because I am not sure, for example, that we would want to get involved this year, in 1977, in laying the keels of eight or ten or twelve offshore ships. It must be phased in consistent with the increase in the amount of fish that is available, that will be available under the 200 mile limit, and again consistent with the attrition or the number of ships that are leaving the fleet for a number of reasons. And to that end this government is committed. We are committed to the rebuilding of that fleet one way or the other to some point down the road, and hopefully not too far, where we will be able to harvest the fish that will be necessary to insure well, eventually, full employment in our large number of processing plants in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER: To that end I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that in the Province at the present time we have fourteen plants that service the offshore fleet, we call them all-year-around plants. We have 101 plants that are catering to the inshore fleet, plants that operate maybe twenty-five, thirty, forty per cent of their time. We have the processing capability of 1.2 billion pounds a year, 1,200 million pounds of fish a year, when in fact, we are only this year 1976 we will land and process slightly in excess of 500 million pounds.

So you see we

MR. W. CARTER:

we have fish plants that have cost substantial amounts of money both from the public and private sector that are now operating at less than forty per cent of their true operating capacity. I ask you Mr. Speaker, what business today can really make a contribution to the community, the Province or can really do justice to the people who are depending on that plant, that operation, that business for a livelihood if they can only operate or if, at least, their doors are locked, if the plant is lying dormant for seventy per cent of its time. That is one of the big problems today that we have in Newfoundland.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the figure of forty per cent, of course, includes not only the plants that operate more or less all the year-round but it includes the plants on the Northeast Coast that just close down for a large part of the year. Averaged out it comes to about forty per cent.

MR. W. CARTER: Averaged, Mr. Speaker, we have the processing capability of 1,200 million pounds of fish a year based on an eight hour shift -

MR. SMALLWOOD: All of them?

MR. W. CARTER: Yes, all of them. Based on an eight hour shift, 250 days per shift.

Now if you want to have it two shift, which is not at all unusual, well then, of course, you can multiply that and you have a capability of 2.4 billion pounds. Be that as it may, the plants that we have on the basis of landings in 1975 which was in the order of 400 million pounds meant that the plants were, on the average, operating at thirty per cent of their real operating capability.

In 1976 that figure will increase slightly because, as I said earlier, landings have increased. We have a longliner fleet at the present time of 600 boats ranging in length from thirty-two feet up to a maximum of sixty-five feet. We have about 6,000 small traditional Newfoundland fishing boats manned by probably a man and his son. We are not unaware, Mr. Speaker, that the longliner fleet is depleting.

MR. W. CARTER:

Attrition is taking care of a substantial number of these ships every year, ships that are leaving the industry because of old age or being lost at sea and this, that and the other thing. Government will be announcing - I think I can say this without revealing too much before the estimates are brought down and the budget - but we will be undertaking a programme to revitalize the inshore fishing fleet and doing it very substantially.

We will be undertaking plans in the immediate future to find ways to increase the catching effort with respect to the offshore fleet and with respect to the ice infested inaccessible areas of the Northwest Atlantic where that great last stock of codfish are to be found.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the minister permit me? If this were in Committee of Supply, of course, we could chat back and forth and I do appreciate it. I value highly the minister's speech, very highly. It is wonderfully useful information. When he speaks of a fleet of approximately 600 longliners he is talking of boats which, in the main around the Province, with a few exceptions down on the Northwest Coast, for a year or so, there around Ragged Harbour and Doting Cove, Musgrave Harbour with the exception of a few spots, the minister is talking about a fleet which has been on hard times, increasingly so because of the smaller number of fish they have been able to get and the smaller size. So it has become a business that just did not pay. Some of them turned to catching crab and this and that.

Now my question is this -

AN HON. MEMBER: And herring.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And herring, yes. My question is this: As the stocks in the sea, thanks to the 200-mile limit in the next three, four or five years, as the stocks replenish and increase in numbers and size of fish, does the minister see the longliner coming back, staging an important come-back in Newfoundland?

MR. W. CARTER: I am not convinced, Mr. Speaker, that we need 600 longliners. In fact I believe there are

MR. W. CARTER: certain opinions in Ottawa that would say maybe 300 or 400 longliners would suffice. But the longliner I think will play a very, very important role in the continuance of the inshore fishery. When the longliner was first conceived I think it was built mainly to fish for cod. But since then of course there has been a lot of diversification. They are now getting into herring. They are now getting into the crab fishery. Of course up in the Port au Choix area they are heavily involved in the shrimp fishery.

So consequently we must now build a more multi-purpose longliner, which is what we are working on now. It might very well be that we will have to graduate from the traditional wooden ship with a thirteen year life span into maybe a more modern, more powerful steel or maybe aluminum ship which will have a life span of probably twenty-five years and of course that will have a number of very worthwhile advantages for the fishermen. Because today the building of a longliner is an expensive proposition. Today a longliner operator, fully equipped, is a big businessman. He has probably got an investment for which he is responsible one way or the other, maybe as high as \$400,000 or \$500,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are bigger than the big merchant ships -

MR. W. CARTER: I told the fishermen in Port au Choix on Saturday, at a meeting up there that they look at the general merchant with his shelves full of dry goods and groceries and in that community he is looked upon as being the big shot. He is the big entrepreneur in that community, where in fact almost the lowliest fisherman in that community would probably have a much bigger investment, on a much more capital intensive business than that general merchant would have.

So consequently, Mr. Speaker, we have - if I can just continue just for a moment, consequently we have now to get involved in a more powerful, and a more multi-purpose

MR. W. CARTER: longliner fleet, and that is going to cost a lot of money. And therein, Mr. Speaker, lies another problem in that Ottawa some years ago discontinued their subsidy on boats over forty-five feet. The result being now that only longliners under forty-five feet qualify for the old traditional federal bounty. And without some kind of a bounty I am sure that the average fisherman today cannot afford to carry the kind of a debt-load that would be involved in the building of a boat that might cost him \$400,000 and maybe another \$100,00 to equip with the necessary power tools and nets to enable him to successfully prosecute the fishery.

So we are faced with a very serious problem there. Of course then there is the question of licencing. Ottawa has, to a large extent, put an embargo on the licencing of boats, certainly boats that would fish for certain species. And again in Port aux Choix last week I had a number of complaints from fishermen who wanted to get involved in the shrimp fishery, lobster fishery, but who were forbidden because they could not get a licence from the federal government.

But, Mr. Speaker, the problem that we have to face, Sir, and I am sure we are going to find a solution to it, is the business of finding a ways and means to fully utilize the large capital intensive processing capability that we have in the Province.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister allow me?

MR. W. CARTER: I only have three minutes left so will you please make it -

MR. NEARY: By leave, I am quite prepared to let the minister carry on because the information is so valuable. But the question that I want to put to the minister is this, that we probably do have enough longliners in this Province but the trouble is that

MR. NEARY: they are not fishing on a year-round basis. What is the possibility of encouraging fishermen who own longliners on the East Coast, for instance, where you have a Summer or a Fall fishery, to move out on the Southwest corner where they have a Winter fishery and a fishery pretty well on a year-round basis? Because the minister is quite right. They cannot meet their commitments fishing five or six months out of a year. Whereas

Mr. Neary.

if they were fishing on a year-round basis with the heavy investment they have, if they were mobile, could move around the Province, go out on the Southwest coast in the Wintertime and fish, then they would be fishing more or less on a year-round basis, and it would help the fish plants in that area to supply them with fish. What is the possibility of this happening?

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, that is an excellent point, and that is one that we are certainly addressing ourselves to, and that is what I meant when I said a moment ago that we are going to have to be building - our next effort in building longliners will have to be boats of greater carrying capability, power and maybe more comfort on board for the crew. Because on Saturday I visited the marine service centre in Port Saunders. On that parking lot around the service centre I saw eighty-five longliners, I suppose, with a total investment of \$10 million. And these boats were lying there for - how long? - three or four months? They will be there four months. So there is a \$10 million investment, part of which, of course, is from the public sector, a lot from the private sector that is lying idle there for probably one-third of the year. I see no reason, Mr. Speaker, why with certain incentives, with the provision of proper boats, maybe metal, steel boats, where these fishermen could not now be fishing up off the Southwest corner of the Island, servicing the plants in Isle aux Morts, the plant that is the concern of my hon. colleague, servicing the plant in Burnt Island, Rose Blanche, Port aux Basques -

MR. NEARY: Fox Roost, Margaree.

MR. W. CARTER: Right, Fox Roost, Margaree, and all these places. That is something we certainly will have to look into, because like I said a boat that costs \$400,000, you cannot afford to have that boat lying idle for three months of the year. So that is why, like I said, we will have to get involved in the provision

Mr. W. Carter.

of bigger and better boats, better equipped boats and more powerful boats.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order, please!

The hon. minister's time is just about up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): By leave? It is agreed.

The hon. minister - leave is given.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I contend that Newfoundland will never achieve any great degree of prosperity as long as we have fish plants in the Province that have been built at great public expense and private money that are lying idle for seventy per cent of their time. That, I think, defies every law and every rule of economics.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER: I contend that we will never have a real prosperous fishing industry in the Province as long as we have longliners costing maybe as high as \$500,000, lying idle for three or four months of the year. Of course, by the same token, I suppose, I can carry it a step further and say that we can never hope to have a real successful fishery or a buoyant economy as long as we have fishermen, many thousands of fishermen, who are unable to prosecute the fishery for any more than two or three or four months a year.

MR. NOLAN: Would the hon. minister permit a question?

MR. W. CARTER: Sure.

MR. NOLAN: The speaker who is to follow the hon. minister will not be here on Thursday, and he is hoping to get in whatever he has to say this afternoon, and I am wondering if the minister could give me some idea of how long he might be so that we can judge over here. I will try to arrange the speaking arrangement.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that I have been allowed to continue beyond my allotted time. I would not mind

Mr. W. Carter.

yielding to the hon. gentleman opposite, maybe, on the condition that I might be able to continue afterwards.

MR. NOLAN: No, no. I am just wondering how long the minister will be?

MR. W. CARTER: Well give me another ten or fifteen minutes, and I will be very happy to take my seat.

MR. O'BRIEN: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister a question? I was wondering, Sir - I heard you mention earlier - I do not think you went as far as you probably had meant to have gone on it, when you spoke about the inshore plants on the Island being short of fish, most of them half the year. And I think you started to talk something about hopefully, eventually down the road, joint ventures or more draggers to help people, all the inshore plants going all year-round to make it more viable for the operators and indeed the workers. I wonder, Sir, if you would care to elaborate on that a little further, please?

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I was coming to that. We have some very definite ideas on that and some very definite plans. We believe that we can devise and way and means to keep most of these inshore plants, certainly the ones that are capable of operating all year around, we can keep them operating certainly to a much larger extent than they are now. And there are plants on the Island that are seasonal plants and I suppose until there have been some extensive alterations and modifications effected in those plants they will probably continue that way.

I am thinking for example of the plant in La Scie. I think the plant in La Scie has excellent potential for maybe an all year-round operation -

AN HON. MEMBER: Except in Marystown.

MR. W. CARTER: Yes but that is something that might not be a big factor in future. We look upon the 200-mile limit, Mr. Speaker, as an excellent opportunity to develop the fishery and to maybe, by doing certain things, keeping a lot of these plants operating on an all year-round basis, a lot of them. Not all of them but a lot of them. We envisage the setting up of a central landing port, or maybe more than one port, where fish can be caught during certain times of the year by ships that will be manned by Newfoundlanders and to all intents and purposes will be part of the Canadian fishing effort where fish can be caught in the Northern areas where the total allowable catch by the way will be increasing now by about, I believe it is 15,000 or 20,000 tons a year.

For example in 1977 the allowable catch is 166,000 metric tons. The scientists are projecting that in 1978 it will be about 190,000. So they are going to steadily increase. So we envisage the landing of fish into a central port in our Province in these ships, part of the Canadian and Newfoundland fishing effort, manned by trained young, and hopefully well paid, young Newfoundlanders where this fish will be held in storage, in cold storage, and then during the off season when plants would normally be closing their doors because of a scarcity of fish, this fish would then be transported to these plants

MR. W. CARTER:

by reefer trucks which I am told can be done for about a cent a pound. I am told that the company that is operated by my colleague's, my friend's - I think your cousin is operating a plant in La Scie and he can transport fish to Witless Bay at a cost of one cent a pound, frozen fish.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Where to?

MR. W. CARTEP: From La Scie to Witless Bay. Trucks that can carry as high as 40,000 pounds, a fleet of trucks, twenty reefer trucks at a cost of \$1 million to buy, but trucks that can be leased by any of these. The Day-Ross, the large leasing companies, could pretty well supply the so-called seasonal plants on the Northeast Coast for forty-two weeks of the year.

We envisage landing -

MR. SMALLWOOD: It would not be only the all year plants it would be the partial year.

MR. W. CARTER: Right. Because the all year-round plants, Mr. Speaker, will pretty well be able to look after themselves. As the stocks increase, as their catching effort increases, well then it is, I think, quite reasonable to assume that within a couple of years, maybe 1980, these plants will be self-sustaining. We have to do something to ensure that the plants in La Scie for example, Twillingate, Change Islands, Valleyfield, Bonavista, St. Anthony maybe, that these plants are kept operating certainly as long as we can and as close to all year round as possible.

MR. NEARY: Five or seven years down the road?

MR. W. CARTER: No, not five or seven. We are looking - I think the next three years in Newfoundland will be crucial years and I said the other day at Rotary that between now and 1980 we have approximately 1,000 days left. Without wishing to overdramatize the situation I think that is going to be 1,000 days of very decisive action, 1,000 days of hard work, planning and I hope success between now and 1980.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the minister yield a moment?

Mr. Smallwood:

This idea of bringing fish into a central place where it would be held in storage, and from which it would be delivered throughout the short season to plants that operate now only part of the year, that idea does that depend - to what extent does it depend on shared, what do they call it? joint - what is the word?

AN HON. MEMBER: Joint effort.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Joint effort projects? And to what extent can it be done, and be met by our own fleet?

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I should point out that the 1977 joint venture is, we think, an extremely worth-while operation. I can defend it, and I have done it around the Province, and I believe I have had the effect of convincing my audiences that given all the facts that that is a defensible proposition as far as we are concerned. We are entering into a 6,000 ton joint venture - which is, what? - one per cent of the actual fish caught in that area four years ago.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is only a one year deal.

MR. W. CARTER: That is a one year operation, a pilot operation. And I do not mind telling the House that this government -

MR. RIDEOUT: It is not above our quota.

MR. W. CARTER: It is part of the Canadian quota. I do not mind telling the House that this government would object to any further joint ventures of that type say for 1977, because we believe there is no need for two or three pilot operations, there is no need for two or three prototypes or two or three experiments when you are dealing with the same type of a situation. So it was on that basis that DREE did not see any need for there being any other joint ventures in any other part of Atlantic Canada until ours had been undertaken and carefully assessed. And we are on record, of course, as having objected -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Will that be done in one year?

MR. W. CARTER: One year.

PREMIER MOORES: Yes.

MR. W. CARTER: One year. The present joint venture will involve 6,000 metric tons. There will be 2,400 tons of fish landed in the Province, half for Harbour Grace which is a typical, well maybe not a typical, but certainly a seasonal operation, and 1,200 tons landed in what is an average all year around plant. And there are a number of advantages that can be derived from that joint venture. One, of course, that we are going to be exposed to the Germany technology. As a Newfoundlander, of course, I can say this that we might think in Newfoundland that we have all the answers or we know all about fishing but it is only when you visit one of these \$25 million freezer factory ships, such as the Germans have, do you realize just how far behind we are. So we can learn a lot from these joint ventures. We have observed, For example, a young Naval architect, who is on my staff, is now on board of these German ships making notes, listening, learning, absorbing what is happening.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is only one year.

MR. W. CARTER: Pardon?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is only one year.

MR. W. CARTER: One year. One year.

PREMIER MOORES: Yes that is right.

MR. W. CARTER: It is one year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What about a second year or a third year?

MR. W. CARTER: No, no. I can get into that, Mr. Speaker. We have gear technologists on board of those ships, men who are expert in the technology of gear. We have experienced sea captains, young, bright, smart, enterprising sea captains.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Dragger captains.

MR. W. CARTER: Dragger captains. Some as a matter of fact were trained by my hon. colleague during his days in the fishing industry. Expert young people, bright, alert young people who are on board of these ships listening and watching as to what is going on, and hopefully learning. That is one advantage we can derive from this joint venture, our exposure to the German technology, which is very important. The second, and maybe even more important is the fact that we are now

Mr. W. Carter:

going to be given a chance to enter the European market, and I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that maybe the most important aspect of this 1977 joint venture is that we have succeeded after a long and painful journey, we have succeeded in aligning ourselves with what I think, and I am sure others will verify this, probably the best advanced fish company in Europe, a company that is a giant.

The Nordsa Company in German is equal, I suppose, to General Motors or Lever Brothers or General Foods in the North America Continent. They are big, they are giants. Their total sales production last year was a half a billion dollars, \$500 million . They have been in business now for ninety-seven years. People who have 265 retail outlets in Europe, and people who have an excellent reputation.

These are -

MR. W. CARTER: the people that we are in bed with as the saying goes. And I think that is an excellent combination.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the minister tell us how these capable young Newfoundlanders who are out this year for a year on these German boats, how the skill and knowledge and information and know-how that they pick up in that year will be used by them after the year is over?

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, 1978 will be an entirely new ball game in fisheries in Newfoundland, an entirely new ball game, and the present 1977 joint venture I suggest will be the first and last of its kind.

In 1978 we have to increase our own catching efforts. Now there is no such thing as the hon. member knows, I am sure, as an instant boat building programme. If we were to embark today on a massive boat building programme you are probably talking three or four years down the road before that ship is actually capable of heading out to sea. But these are three very critical years because in that thousand days or three years there will be habits forming. There will be moves made by other provinces, people trying to get in on this great new bonanza in the North. So we have to be ready to take our part there as well. So therefore we have to acquire catching effort. We have to train our young men to serve on these ships because it is not like serving on a typical Newfoundland longliner or a typical Grand Bank 150 foot trawler. This is an entirely new concept and I should point out that if you go aboard of these ships it is almost like walking into the Holiday Inns, or some well known hotel. The accommodations are excellent. You have crew accommodation there with pannelled bedrooms, you have reading rooms, cafeteria facilities, almost anything you can get in a modern hotel. And the money is excellent as well.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Almost as good as the accommodation on the Frank D. Moores and the Joseph R. Smallwood. Almost as good.

MR. W. CARTER: Almost as good but carrying a more valuable cargo maybe.

AN HON. MEMBER: They have changed the name.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Let us start a revolution now. Who says they changed the name?

MR. MURPHY: It is called the Roger Simmons.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman asked me what roles these young sea captains and observers play in the future scheme of things. Well we are not going to be content to abdicate our responsibility as fish catchers, fishermen. Surely any Newfoundlander would be unworthy of the name if he were to even suggest or entertain the thought that in future we will let the West Germans catch our fish. We will let the Poles catch our fish, or the Spaniards. Our objective is to increase our own catching effort and to train our own people to serve on these ships and that is where these observers and other young captains and gear technologists will play a role in conjunction with our Fisheries College.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What ships?

MR. W. CARTER: Ships.

MR. J. WINSOR: Charter, buy, build?

MR. W. CARTER: We have to increase our catching effort in 1978 that would be capable maybe of landing in this Province' an additional 30,000 or 40,000 tons of fish.

MR. SMALLWOOD: From the Hamilton Banks?

MR. W. CARTER: From the East Northern waters, from the areas known as 2J3KL, not only the Hamilton Banks but certainly north of that area as well.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But that will not be by our existing boats.

MR. W. CARTER: Our boats, Mr. Speaker, are unable to penetrate that area. These are ice infested waters and to build a ship that

MR. W. CARTER: could penetrate the ice infested Hamilton Banks would cost, I suppose, in the order of \$8 million, \$10 million, or \$12 million.

But it is our intention, our objective, we are committed to the proposition that we are going to acquire our own catching effort by way of charter, lease, purchase and eventually by our construction.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But not joint effort.

MR. W. CARTER: Not the 1977 variety. We envisage having these ships at our disposal, being manned by Newfoundlanders, trained by the Fisheries College, maybe trained

Mr. W. Carter.

on these ships during the off-season, and these ships then will be part of the fleet that will be landing the fish to our cold storage areas for processing at a later date to the so-called seasonal plants. Mr. Speaker, I probably abused the privileges that have been extended to me by my colleagues so maybe I should bring my speech to an end. Mr. Speaker, I have unbounded faith in the fishing industry of our Province. I believe that the next three years will be critical years in our history. I believe that during that three years there will emerge in our Province a new fishery oriented middle and middle upper class group of young primary producers, fishermen. I believe that within that three or four year period there will emerge a new breed of Newfoundland fishermen, a breed of young Newfoundlanders well-trained, well-educated, articulate and, I suppose, probably more important well-paid young Newfoundlanders who will be involved in the fishing industry. It is going to be an extremely exciting three years, three or four or five years. It is going to be a very exciting time to be a fisherman in Newfoundland. It is going to be an exciting time to be involved in the fisheries, and I can speak with some knowledge of just how exciting it is to be Minister of Fisheries. I am not discouraged by the type of comment that I heard today on radio by the president and managing director of one of our big companies, somebody who accused me, I think, of being, maybe a bit to pro labour.

MR. MORGAN: A negative comment.

MR. W. CARTER: As a matter of fact having come from a fishing community, of fishing parents, it is difficult for me not to be pro-fisherman. But notwithstanding, I have endeavoured during the past year to steer a pretty centre of the road course. But when I hear comments like I heard today from that certain gentleman, well then it is making my job in that

Mr. W. Carter.

respect much more difficult. I am not sure if he meant it or not, but certainly I think his words were not well-chosen, and when he talks about government involvement in the fishery, well then I have yet to have any fish merchants come to me and say, "Look, you know, we do not want that kind of help. We are not going to accept it, and would you please take it and spend it elsewhere."

So again, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for extending me the courtesy of going beyond my forty-five minutes, and I hope to have more to say on the fishery maybe during the budget or some later debate. A

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have to confess that I had not intended to participate in this debate today, but I realize that one hon. gentleman opposite had planned to speak this afternoon and has a commitment on Thursday. But there are just a few words that I would like to say this afternoon. Firstly, may I commend my colleague, the hon. Minister of Fisheries, for what I believe is one of the strongest and most optimistic exposés and elucidations we have had on the fishery, and a vote of confidence in the fishery certainly that I have seen since I have been a member of this Legislature for eleven years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: I would like to have just a few words in my capacity as the Minister responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs. We could have a very lengthy debate, I would suggest, in this House on federal/provincial relations. We could have a very lengthy debate on the alienation that is so obvious and so frightening on the part of the provinces toward the central government. I am sure that no one in this House is very proud when he or she finds themselves in Alberta or in the Prairie Provinces or the West and hear nothing but scorn

Mr. Hickman.

directed toward our national government. We cannot be very proud when we are in Atlantic Canada and you hear that same sort of sentiment. And one is not very impressed with the attitude that has been so obvious and so evident from the people in the largest province of all, Ontario. And then

MR. HICKMAN:

we had the vote in Quebec recently which resulted in the Levesque government coming to office dedicated to the separation of their Province from the rest of Canada. One should not - Mr. Speaker, those of us who have had the opportunity to meet with some of the very articulate and very able ministers from the Province of Quebec, I would say the ablest in the last twenty years when it comes to sheer ability and sheer dedication to a cause - one should never lull himself or herself into believing that this was simply a change of government because the Bourassa administration was no longer standing in good stead in the eyes of Quebecers. There is more to it than that.

These people believe that they have received a mandate to work assiduously in the next two or three years to convince their people, the residents of their province, that they should leave us. Now that is a long ways down the road. I do not expect, and I would hope, that this does not occur. If it did occur the ramifications and the legalities involved would be such that still we might not see that accomplished for a long time.

But what I am concerned about, Mr. Speaker, is that the traumatic experience that one would have expected as a result of the Quebec vote has not taken place, that we have not seen that kind of sensitivity on the part of the national government towards the needs of Canada, towards the dedication to Canadian unity that one would have expected that the Quebec election would have brought to the fore. We have not seen in this Province - and I realize I have to choose my word very carefully because if as Minister responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs I lash out at the government in Ottawa I am told I am biting the hands that feed a few crumbs to the Province of Newfoundland so I had better be careful. On the other hand -

MR. NEARY: Some crumbs!

MR. HICKMAN: Some crumbs, Mr. Speaker. I thought the hon. gentlemen opposite would fall for that. They should take a look - do not look at equalization because equalization is not something, is not a crumb to the Province of Newfoundland. Equalization benefits is something that

MR. HICKMAN:

we, as Canadians, are entitled to. It has got nothing to do with the fact that we are Newfoundlanders, it has all to do with the fact that we are Canadians. It has all to do with the fact that we are part of a -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: - captive clientele of upper Canada. That is what it has to do with. So do not look at equalization, do not look at what we used to get for post-secondary education. Do not look at Medicare and say these are crumbs. These are things that all Canadians are entitled to. But if you think that the crumbs are not getting smaller, just take a look at the vote, the estimates that were tabled in the House the other day, For Newfoundland, Department of Public Works of Canada; the environment building, a study for a computer building, a public building for Fortune, and that was about the crumbs, all totalled, \$2 million or \$3 million or \$4 million or \$5 million.

MR. NEARY: \$15 million from our government.

MR. HICKMAN: No, the Department of Public Works, not MOT. We will come to that later on. Look at the vote from that department for the Ottawa-Hull area, two cities where I would be prepared to say there is little if any unemployment because most of the people in that area are sustained by the Canadian taxpayer from coast to coast. I have no doubt that the millions and millions, the \$30 million, \$40 million, \$50 million that the Department of Public Works will put into the Ottawa-Hull area this year is well deserved. I am not arguing with that at all.

But what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that the Government of Canada has been made very much aware, not only by Statistics Canada, but by some very strong representation by this government, of the level of employment in Newfoundland and indeed in Atlantic Canada at this time. We have asked for

MR. HICKMAN:

an acceleration of public spending because of the fact that so much of our economy is dependent upon the construction industry and the construction industry is dependent to such a large extent upon the public dollar as opposed to the private dollar. I am having great difficulty, Mr. Speaker, in finding the kind of sensitivity that one would expect from a national government dedicated to national unity. I find it something less than being total Canadian when the government of the Province headed by the Premier of the Province makes representation to the Prime Minister of Canada on October 18, 1976, shortly after the Speech from the Throne was read in Ottawa where there was talk of a lot of new programmes, of job creation programmes that would be sensitive to areas of high unemployment.

On October 18, 1976 the representation was made. This is from the Prime Minister of a province. It does not make any difference if it is a Prime Minister of a province or a Premier of a province that has a Conservative government or a Liberal government or an NDP government, that is not relevant. What it means is this, that it is the Premier of a province speaking for all of the people. When a Premier or a Prime Minister puts his hand, his signature to a document he is not signing as a Progressive Conservative from Newfoundland or when Premier Campbell signs from Prince Edward Island he is not signing as a Liberal Premier from Prince Edward Island, he is signing as the Premier, the Prime Minister of his province representing all of the people of his province.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that there is something less than sensitivity when the Premier of any province has to wait until January 24, 1977 for even a recognition that Newfoundland does indeed have problems that are peculiar to this area and to some extent peculiar to Atlantic Canada.

MR. NEARY: Did not the minister point out in his campaign they did not want any handouts from Ottawa?

MR. HICKMAN: This government, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: That is right. That is right, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: This land is our land.

MR. HICKMAN: This land is our land, Mr. Speaker, and make no mistake about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: And this land is going to continue to be our land, Mr. Speaker, and make no mistake about it. And the time will come, Mr. Speaker, when the national government speaking through the Minister of Mines and Energy in Ottawa will exercise their constitutional responsibility and say, "No one province has the right to stop or impede the development of another because constitutionally if it is in the national interest the Government of Canada has an absolute right and indeed a responsibility to declare that if work is in the national interest and under our British North America Act, under our constitution, then they can preclude and prevent any one province from impeding the development of another."

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. HICKMAN: We have suffered, Mr. Speaker, in this Province since the days of the LeSage administration. The hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) will remember the very courageous statements that were made by the then leader of the government in this Province when he took on Prime Minister LeSage and so he did and so he should have.

But the regrettable thing was then as it is now that the national government was not prepared to assert and exercise its national responsibility and to declare that that work, that transmission line was in the public interest, the national interest and therefore if it is in the national interest it has the right to be built unimpeded by any province, out of national funds. The hon. Alistair Gillespie has come dangerously close to saying that. Last Spring in Chatham in Cape Cod he announced that he felt that it was in the national interest to see that the energy of Labrador be made available to other Canadian provinces.

MR. NEARY: Was the minister there?

MR. HICKMAN: I certainly was. I was present when he made it. I was there when he made it in Cape Cod. I was there, Mr. Speaker, when the confrontation took place between the Prime Minister of Nova Scotia and

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Gillespie and I suggested to Mr. Gillespie publicly that this Province would welcome that kind of activity, that kind of decision making by the Government of Canada. But unfortunately the Government of Canada has not taken that same position that the Minister of Mines and Energy indicates that he is prepared to take in the national interest. And we are still, we are still, Mr. Speaker, to a large extent the captive of the failure of an enunciation of a policy that the development of energy in Canada is in the national interest and is a national project.

And what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, to get back to what I started with in the beginning, is that one as Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs has to tread a very fine line, and the fine line is this, and I say it without any hesitancy, that the hon. Marcel Lessard, the Minister of Regional and Economic Expansion shows more sensitivity, more concern for the Province of Newfoundland than any minister in Ottawa, bar none.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. HICKMAN: The first minister in Ottawa who has been prepared to publicly make a commitment to the North part of our Province, that was Mr. Lessard. And I have found him, Mr. Speaker, to be a man who has committed last year more money than has ever been committed under DREE to programmes that are well documented, well researched and well presented and there will be more. I would predict, Mr. Speaker, confidently, that by the time our planning is finalized, on or before March 31st., this month, before March 31st. of this month, that you will see three or four more very strong subsidiary agreements falling into place with the very generous, sympathetic and understanding co-operation of the hon. Marcel Lessard.

And that is the kind of co-operation that I think

MR. HICKMAN: this Province is entitled to. But, Mr. Speaker, we are getting away, let us not get away from what I said earlier and that is that as part of the Confederacy, as part of this Confederacy, as part of the whole theme of Confederation, then surely we are entitled, in times of what we hope to be temporary stress, to see the Canadian nation put that few extra development dollars forthwith.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. HICKMAN: And there we have not seen it.

MR. NEARY: What about the computer centres?

MR. HICKMAN: The computer centre will be the first federal public building, other than the post office, in the capital city of this Province since the Sir Humphrey Gilbert Building?

MR. NEARY: Who brought it here?

MR. HICKMAN: Since the Sir Humphrey Gilbert Building. And Mr. Speaker, let me say, and I have great rapport with the hon. Donald Jamieson. He is in a totally different portfolio now, a very prestigious portfolio, one that fortunately for Canada, keeps him in the public eye internationally. But unfortunately he is entitled to expect from his colleagues in the line departments sympathy and understanding for his Province. I can assure him, if he is listening, and I will assure him when I meet with him Friday night, that his colleague, the hon. Marcel Lessard is doing a tremendous job of indicating to us a knowledge and a feel for this Province and the kind of understanding that we so desperately need.

MR. NEARY: - are getting loans from the development corporation.

MR. DOODY: Who Marcel?

MR. HICKMAN: Now the hon. Mr. Lang, who is heart to heart with our -

AN HON. MEMBER: Jig to jowl.

MR. HICKMAN: - Minister of Transportation and Communications, does some unusual things. There is no question about that.

MR. HICKMAN: He is beginning to realize the error of his ways. I would hope, I am sure that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was not speaking for his party when he sided publicly with Mr. Lang on that bus problem that we had this Summer when the CN pouted and took off the buses and locked them up because our Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities demanded that they satisfactorily prove to them that they needed this increase, and took it all away from us.

But I believe, Mr. Lang has learned his lesson there. Because since then, and that was something that brought on the wrath and the condemnation of the other nine provinces, not just provinces with Progressive Conservative administrations or New Democrat, but all of them, Liberal, Tory, Socialist, the whole works, for one time descended upon Ottawa and said to Mr. Lang, "You have invaded a provincial field. You have done something which you said you would not do. You have done something which we find offensive, which we find threatens our provincial rights and you have taken over in Newfoundland a service that obviously you have no concern for and obviously you do not know how to run."

Now since then, as the hon. gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) will confirm, Mr. Lang is showing more reason. I think that he is genuine in his desire to appoint a good commission to examine transportation problems in Newfoundland. I think he is. If the commission or commissioners who are appointed can come up with the kind of recommendation that is anticipated from Commissioner Hall in the west, and if the Government of Canada will then implement it, this has to be to the benefit of Newfoundlanders.

But let me say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it takes a great deal of patience at times when one hears of that kind of arrogant

MR. HICKMAN: attitude that emanated from Ottawa at the time of our difficulties with bus transportation. But I would like to report to this House that whilst sensitivity is slow in coming I am confident that we will this year work out some very satisfactory agreements with that great Canadian, the hon. Marcel Lessard.

I adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker, if I may, and I also move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that this House upon its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, at three o'clock and that this House do now adjourn. /

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved that the House do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 P.M., those in favour "Aye," contrary "Nay", carried.

The House stands adjourned until tomorrow Wednesday, at 3:00 P.M.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

MARCH 1, 1977

Answered by the Honourable Minister of Education

Number 13 on order paper of February 8 - Tom Lush (Terra Nova)

- (1)-: The total number of paid employees of the 14 existing School Tax Authorities as of June 30, 1976, was 45.
- (2) and (3)-: The statistics relating to the total REVENUE and EXPENDITURE of the School Tax Authorities for the period from July 1, 1975, to June 30, 1976, is unavailable at this time due to the fact that only FIVE audited reports out of FOURTEEN have been received at our Department of the Auditor General.

MAR 1 1977

Answered by The Honourable Minister of Education

On Order Paper of February 10 asked by The Honourable Member for LaPoile
Number 95

(1) Members of the Student Aid Appeals Board:-

C. J. McCormick	-	Department of Education
R. Beaufield	-	Department of Education
P. Kennedy	-	Treasury Board
B. Baker	-	Memorial University
T. Careless	-	Memorial University
Paula Gillis	-	Student Council
Sheila McCallum	-	Student Council

- (2) Number of meetings held in the calendar year 1974 - 8; 1975 - 6;
1976 - 5.
- (3) Total number of Appeals processed in the calendar years 1974, 1975,
and 1976 were 87.
- (4) Total number of Appeals processed by the Board in 1974 were 39, with
12 successful and 27 rejected; in 1975 there were 23 processed,
with 9 successful and 14 rejected; and in 1976 there were 25 processed,
with 13 successful and 12 rejected.

MAR 1 1977

Answered by the Honourable Minister of Education

- ✓ Number 81 on order paper of February 9 (LaPoile)
Number 95 on order paper of February 10 (LaPoile)

- (a) The Institute is not funded by the Provincial Government; it is funded by the University from its own resources and from research grants from Federal agencies. Further funding could possibly come from contracts with groups or agencies.
- (b) I do not know what the budget of the Institute is; that is a matter internal to the administration of the University.
- (c) As far as I know, no terms of reference have been given to the Institute by any external authority. The Institute was established by the University and operates under its own constitution which was approved by the Board of Regents in February 1974, shortly before the Institute was established. The purposes of the Institute are listed in that constitution and are attached herewith.
- (d) As the stated purposes of the Institute indicate, its functions are much broader than to deal with the question of illiteracy among graduates. Its broad objective, in my opinion, would be to deal with the whole range of educational activity in the province, or with illiterates within that range which are amenable to educational research. Matters pertaining to "functional illiteracy" may or may not be subject to scientific research.
- (e) There is no evidence to suggest a difference in the educational achievement of students in Newfoundland and the other Atlantic provinces. Even if there were, whether or not the matter could be researched would be a decision of the governing body of the Institute. I personally doubt, however, that this is the kind of broad issue that could be researched since achievement on standardized tests is the result of a large number of complex and sometimes interwoven variables, such as culture, sociological conditions, economic patterns, and instructional factors.

As a matter of interest, the Research Institute is engaged in three specific pieces of research and development for the Department of Education:

- (1) An assessment of Pre-Vocational Programs in the province;
- (2) An evaluation of our examination system, i.e., shared evaluation; and
- (3) The development of a Social Studies Program.

MAR 1 1977